

veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9101. By Mr. MAGRADY: Resolution unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Danville, Pa., favoring enactment of the Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9102. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by Bloomsburg Chapter, Delphian Study Club, under auspices of Columbia County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring enactment of the Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9103. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Chicago Branch, No. 12, Fleet Reserve Association, urging passage of legislation providing for payment in full of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9104. By Mr. REILLY: Petitions from veterans of Oshkosh, Wis., who served during the recent World War, requesting legislation looking toward the immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9105. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of the Sixth District Workers' Conference of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Lincoln, Kans., for Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9106. Also, petition of local Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Plainsville, Kans., for Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9107. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Investment Bankers' Association of America, opposing cash payment of World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive, as in legislative session, a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1533. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust payment of charges due on the Blackfeet Indian irrigation projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 4051. An act authorizing the Pillager Bands of Chipewewa Indians, residing in the State of Minnesota, to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8812. An act authorizing the Menominee Tribe of Indians to employ general attorneys;

H. R. 11281. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 12835. An act authorizing the use of tribal funds of Indians belonging on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses connected with suits pending in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13293. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Frazer, Mont., in the construction of a high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation;

H. R. 15263. An act to relieve restricted Indians in the Five Civilized Tribes whose nontaxable lands are required for State, county, or municipal improvements;

H. R. 15498. An act authorizing the President, through the Secretary of the Interior, to study, report, and recommend on a revision and codification of the statutes affecting the American Indians; and

H. R. 15601. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Poplar, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4665. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.; and

S. 5776. An act to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—GEORGE OTIS SMITH

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to have read a letter about another matter. It will not take very long.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I believe if we had a call for a quorum we would get a vote on the pending resolution very quickly. So I hope the Senator from Tennessee will withhold his letter a little while.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	King	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	La Follette	Smoot
Black	George	McGill	Steiner
Blaine	Gillett	McKellar	Stephens
Blease	Glass	McMaster	Swanson
Borah	Glenn	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Goff	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Goldsborough	Morrow	Townsend
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Tydings
Bulkeley	Harris	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Walcott
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hawes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Waterman
Couzens	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Cutting	Heflin	Ransdell	Wheeler
Dale	Howell	Reed	Williamson
Davis	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	
Deneen	Jones	Sheppard	
Dill	Kean	Shipstead	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], as amended. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the resolution as amended is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 415) as amended is as follows:

Resolved, That the district attorney for the District of Columbia be, and he hereby is, requested to institute proceedings in quo warranto under the code of the said District in the Supreme Court thereof to test the right of George Otis Smith as a member of the Federal Power Commission; that he, the said district attorney, be requested to associate with him counsel for the United States Senate in such proceedings; that the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it hereby is, authorized to engage such counsel, at a cost not to exceed \$2,500, who shall, in the event that the requests herein recited are acceded to, assist the said district attorney in such proceedings. Should the said district attorney decline to institute or prosecute the same, the counsel so to be engaged is hereby authorized and directed to proceed, in the name and on behalf of the United States Senate, under section 233 of Title III of the Code of the District of Columbia, to secure a determination of the right of the said claimant to the position

of member of the Federal Power Commission. The expense of the litigation hereby authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Albert M. Sames, of Arizona, to be United States district judge, district of Arizona, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Bromley Wharton, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States making sundry nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

The Senate having resumed legislative business,

THE LATE SENATOR WARREN AND THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE
STEDMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Miss Anita Schade, president of Asha Faison Colwell Williams Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Washington, D. C., and other members of the memorial committee, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. February 5, 1931.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: The members of the Asha Faison Colwell Williams Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Washington, D. C., wish to express their profound gratitude and deep appreciation to the Vice President of the United States for his most beautiful letter to the chapter in expressing his inability and regret at not being able to be present at the meeting of this chapter on the evening of January 28, in the Caucus Room of the House Office Building, to honor the memory of the late Senator Francis E. Warren and the late Congressman Charles M. Stedman; also to the honorable body of the Members of the United States Senate, we express appreciation.

In the passing of these two great soldiers an opportunity comes to honor their memory in a most appropriate and deserving way, and the Asha Faison Colwell Williams Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, which claims the distinct honor of their (honorary) membership, gentle advice, and assistance in organizing this chapter, offers as a suggestion the hope that the Congress of the United States will make an appropriation to have the portraits of these two esteemed soldiers hung side by side in the United States Capitol as an inspiration for the coming generations.

To them, as well as to the last other brave soldier, Gen. N. D. Hawkins, who was present and assisted in organizing this chapter, and who was the last surviving member of the guard of honor detailed by the Virginia Military Institute commandant to mount guard over the body of Gen. Robert E. Lee at the time of the latter's death, to these soldiers we pay a tribute and are grateful for the example of their Christian lives.

And to the memory of Asha Faison Colwell Williams, whose name the chapter bears and who served as a nurse during the War between the States (1861-1865), we lay a laurel wreath of love and service.

Most respectfully,

Miss Anita Schade, chapter president; Mrs. Charles Fisher Taylor, memorial chairman; Miss Sallie U. Brooks, Mrs. John D. Milligan, Mrs. Thomas Preston Johnson, Mrs. Harold H. Clark, Mrs. Fred L. Volland, Mrs. Adolphus W. Wells, Mrs. John P. Mann, jr., Mrs. S. McDowell Meek, Miss R. Elmore Perkins, Miss Eunice Taylor, Miss Ethel Johnson, Mrs. William Barstow, Miss Fannie Wolfson, Mrs. Livingston Vann, jr., memorial committee.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota favoring amendment of section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to permit the States to tax national banks upon a fair and equitable basis, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. (See resolution printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. SHIPSTEAD.)

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Sixth Women's Patriotic Conference on National De-

fense, opposing all legislative measures that may in any wise diminish, curtail, or prohibit the continuation of military training in any manner, directly or indirectly, as now carried on by the War Department under the provisions of law, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Sixth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, favoring the making of appropriations to carry out the naval construction program approved by the President and now before the Congress before the adjournment thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MOSES (for Mr. KEYES) presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of members of the executive committee of the Maryland Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and sundry other citizens, all of Baltimore, Md., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. F. No. 241

A joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to amend section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to permit the States to tax national banks upon a fair and equitable basis

Whereas since March, 1927, taxes upon national banks in this State and in most of the States of the Nation have been collected, when collected at all, only by voluntary agreement on the part of such banks; and

Whereas such a situation is humiliating to the sovereign States which, instead of being able to exercise the taxing power as a matter of right, are now forced to accept such contributions in the form of taxes as the banks choose to bestow upon them; and

Whereas national banks of Minnesota who have paid taxes during four years past, although claiming the same were higher than taxes upon all other property, now assert they will no longer pay bank taxes unless the same be reduced one-half; and

Whereas the loss of revenue occasioned by the failure of banks to pay their taxes will materially affect every town, county, village, city, and school district in this State in which a bank is situate, and the State revenue will also be materially affected, and thereby the farmers, home owners, and all other taxpayers will be required to pay additional taxes; and

Whereas no reason exists why section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, should not be so amended as to permit national banks to be taxed on the same basis, subject to the same safeguards against discrimination as State banks, trust banks, and other similar national institutions; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota, acting through the Minnesota Bank Tax Commission, caused to be introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress bills for the purpose of amending section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, as to permit reasonable and fair taxation of national banks, in December, 1927, and such commission, in cooperation with other States, has advocated the passage of said bills before committees of such Congress and has had repeated conferences with representatives of the American Bankers' Association, representing bankers of the entire Nation; and

Whereas in the month of May, 1929, an agreement was reached with said American Bankers' Association upon the terms of a bill amendatory of section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, and a bill embodying such compromise was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives on May 9, 1930, but no action has been taken by said committee thereon, and a further hearing has been fixed on said bill before said committee on February 4, 1931; and

Whereas the situation is critical and urgent and calls for immediate relief to be extended to the State of Minnesota and other States interested, and threatens serious loss of revenue to all the States, and to Minnesota alone from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 per year, all of which must be borne by other taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, urgently memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary at the earliest possible time to remedy the situation by passing the compromise bill referred to herein, or some other workable and practicable amendment to section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, which will afford relief to the already overburdened farmers, home owners,

and other taxpayers in Minnesota and other States interested; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota are hereby also urgently requested to do everything in their power in support of such legislation.

The secretary of state is hereby directed to forward duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate and chairman of the House of Representatives, and a copy to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

HENRY ARENS,
President of the Senate.

OSCAR A. SWENSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 29th day of January, 1931.

G. H. SPAETH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 29th day of January, 1931.

JOHN I. LEVIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 2, 1931.

FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor.

Filed February 2, 1931.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy with record of the original resolution in my office of S. F. 241, Laws 1931, and that said copy is a true and correct transcript of said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 2d day of February, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

RELIEF OF DROUGHT SUFFERERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the attention of Senators for just a moment?

We have heard a great deal about the drought situation in my part of the country. I desire to ask Senators to listen to a letter which came to me this morning from Mr. B. L. Mallory, of Memphis, who owns a large plantation in Arkansas, who gives it his personal attention, and who, I think, knows as much about the situation as any man in the country, I do not care where he comes from.

Mr. Mallory is one of our leading citizens. There is no more honest and no straighter man in the world than Mr. B. L. Mallory. I have been associated with him in many matters during nearly all our lives, and I want to read what he has to say about the drought situation. I ask Senators to listen to this letter:

SOUTH MEMPHIS LAND CO.,
Memphis, Tenn., February 2, 1931.

Senator K. D. McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: I find your telegram of the 31st on my return from Chicago, where I spent Saturday in conference with our executive committee on inland waterway matters.

Saw in this morning's paper where you have referred same telegram to several other parties here. Should Mr. Creekmore or Mr. Williams confer with us, I for one will certainly strongly advocate the positive taking off the market the 1,300,000 bales of cotton now held by the Federal Farm Board. Certainly this cotton as now held is a pressure on the market, for the general impression is that it can be purchased at any time in any quantity. Will be glad to get copy of hearing so soon as you are able to send it to me.

Senator McKELLAR, it would be hard for you to realize the situation right at our doors across the river in Arkansas. It seems impossible that a section of our country, which 18 months ago was in good financial condition, could within so short a time see its people become beggars and penniless, and in the hands of the Red Cross.

While the Red Cross, from what I can understand, is giving substantial relief, yet I exceedingly regret that we have to be advertised to the world as living off public charity. I read in a Chicago paper yesterday under large headlines the statement that Arkansas, a State having a population of 2,000,000 people, one-fourth of them were hungry and penniless, and from my understanding, and what I know to be facts, this statement very near tells the story.

While the Red Cross is a necessity for immediate relief to unfortunates of our country, the situation in Arkansas can not be cured in a week or a month's time. Food and clothing for the people and food for their stock is the trouble that must be overcome, and must come from some source up to the time of har-

vesting the next crop. I am positive in my belief that our Government should be handling the Arkansas situation on an entirely different line.

I am interested in the cultivation of some 4,000 acres of ground in the eastern part of Arkansas; our managers and the people in that section were in hopes it would not be necessary to see our farm tenants go to the Red Cross. I am sure you are sufficiently well acquainted with the temperament of our tenant labor to know that if the Red Cross is taking care of tenants on a farm 10 miles distant from your plantation, it would not be long before the labor on your plantation would be clamoring for the same free food being served to the tenants on the farm 10 miles away. In other words, those of us who are trying to carry on and feed our labor are unable to do so, and I tell you with no little degree of shame that the tenants on some 4,000 acres of farming ground that I am operating in Arkansas are receiving supplies from the Red Cross.

As much as we dislike to see our labor being furnished with food through the Red Cross, we could not prevent it, unless we would feed our labor free, as the Red Cross is doing, and that we are not financially able to do.

The Government at present has an organized force located at Memphis loaning Government money to the farmers for the purchase of food for their stock, for the purchase of seed to plant the new crop, and for fertilizer. This method of helping the farmers is doing good, so far as it goes; however, this plan is not meeting the situation, it falls far short of helping those who can help themselves were they in a position to secure sufficient funds to operate their farms in the same manner as they did before the drought.

To bring my thought more clearly to you, I relate two instances, and there are thousands of just such cases in this drought-stricken territory. Two farmers, a Mr. Horton and Mr. Atkins, came to my office last week and related their situation, which I know is as they stated it to me, for I am thoroughly familiar with their conditions. These two farmers rent the ground they cultivate, one of them 200 acres, the other 150 acres. Their story was exactly the same, and it was this: They had their work stock, they had cows and some hogs, sufficient stock food in the barns to last them until March, but they had no money to operate their places for the coming season. One of them has 8 tenant families on his place, the other 12 tenant families, most of them colored. These tenants have not a week's ration ahead.

Through this agency now established in Memphis, each one of these men could possibly secure about \$400 for stock food, and possibly \$50 for planting seed—other than cotton—they have sufficient cottonseed for planting, and as their ground is most fertile, they do not need any fertilizer. Horton and Atkins state they can plant their crops and carry on until the crops are ready to harvest for \$2,000 each. In other words, they will feed their stock, they will feed all labor on their places, and carry their work on in full operation, if they can secure a loan of \$2,000, giving as security their stock and the crop they will produce.

Should these men secure the \$450 for stock food and seed through the agency now located here, they would be required to give a first mortgage on their crop; should they give such a mortgage they would be prevented from securing any additional loans from other sources, as they have no other collateral to put up. You readily see farmers who have the ability and everything necessary, except finances, to go forward with planting their crop are left without means of assistance from the Government, and can not get it from other sources. There are hundreds and hundreds of just such farmers in Arkansas, many smaller and many larger than the two cases I have here described. The number of tenants and their families depending on such farmers runs into the many thousands.

Were these farmers put into position to finance themselves, they in turn would feed these thousands of tenants, and the Red Cross would be relieved of any further work so soon as they could be financed and begin operation. The two farmers above mentioned produce yearly approximately 100 bales of cotton each; last year their production was about one-third off on cotton, and at least 75 per cent off in their food crops. With their cotton selling at one-half price of previous years you can well see their situation.

Now, Senator McKELLAR, I have given you here a true picture of the situation that now exists in one of the most fertile valleys of this Nation. If the \$25,000,000 the Senate and House are now disagreeing over could be quickly placed in the hands of proper Government officials, with instructions to advance the farmers of Arkansas as a loan, being secured by the crop produced this year, I believe it is safe to say that 80 per cent of the money so advanced would be returned. In other words, the Government would only be running the risk of losing about 20 per cent of the amount so loaned, and the Red Cross would be quickly relieved of the greater part of the work which they are undertaking, which work must continue by some agency to a greater or less extent for the next six months if not handled in some way as here suggested.

This same picture to a greater or less extent extends throughout this entire cotton-producing section, and some agency should be put to work immediately that will enable our people to get to work and stay at work until the next crop is harvested. This delta country has had its financial structure so disarranged that the greater part of our heretofore well-to-do farmers are running from pillar to post seeking financial assistance. The tenant labor under them is being fed from week to week by them or the Red Cross with the hope that some arrangement will be made to enable their farming operations to go forward.

The Cotton Cooperative Association at Greenwood, Miss., and other cooperative associations are doing all in their power to relieve the situation, but small or intermediate farmers are finding it difficult to find some source that will help them.

If some method could be quickly brought into operation to help such farmers as I have here described, I am sure the situation would take on a brighter aspect immediately.

Is it not possible that the power of the present organization now distributing some \$15,000,000 here could not be enlarged and let them furnish food for each person on these farms in addition to the stock food, seed, and fertilizer, say until August 1? Add to this \$25,000,000 Congress is now fighting over, and let the \$40,000,000 be put out as a loan, as above outlined, and secured by the livestock and crop produced. I am confident such an arrangement would meet the situation nearer than any other one that we could devise.

Pardon me for this lengthy letter, but I believe you would like to know the situation as it exists.

Yours very sincerely,

B. L. MALLORY.

P. S.—Since writing the above letter I have received one of the applications for the farm loans, which is being used by the Government organization recently established here, and inclose same for your inspection. I very much doubt if such an application, strictly adhered to, could be used in 10 per cent of the cases now in distress in Arkansas.

Little or no fertilizer will be used in this Arkansas delta section. None but the very largest farmers are using tractors, and that part of this loan for gas, oil, and fertilizer is useless in these cases; however, every one of these farmers, big and little, need food for their tenants and for their stock, and the usual necessary funds to operate the farm. If relief of any great measure is to come out of the Government funds now available, the present plan must be changed and greatly enlarged on, and more liberal in its method of use.—B. L. M.

Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a blank application issued by the Government agency at Memphis which is to be used in the making of the loans provided for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Form No. 2

(All questions on this application must be answered; omissions will cause delay)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARMERS' SEED LOAN OFFICE.	(Do not write in this space)	
	No.	Date received
	Application examined by	
	Mortgage and note examined by	
		Approved for

NOTE.—Section 2 of the joint resolution of Congress provides as follows: "That any person who shall knowingly make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale, or in assisting in obtaining such loan, advance, or sale under this resolution shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both."

APPLICATION FOR SEED, FERTILIZER, AND FEED LOAN IN SPRING OF 1931

(Post-office address where I receive my mail) (Date) 1931.

I,, hereby make application to the United States of America for a loan of dollars (\$.....), which will be used for the purchase of seed, fertilizer, feed, and/or fuel and oil for tractors, to apply as follows:

\$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of corn.
 \$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of oats.
 \$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of cotton.
 \$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of
 \$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of
 \$..... for seed and fertilizer for acres of
 \$..... for feed for work stock for actual farming operations.
 \$..... for fuel and oil for tractors for use in crop production.
 \$..... for other purposes incident to crop production.

State purposes and amounts for each:

Such loan is to be made from the appropriation for the aid of farmers in drought and storm stricken areas for the purchase of seed, fertilizer, feed and/or fuel and oil for tractors, under the joint resolution of Congress approved December 20, 1930.

This application is accompanied by (a) promissory note in the form prescribed and furnished by the Department of Agriculture; by (b) chattel mortgage, duly executed by the undersigned in such manner as to entitle it to filing, upon the crops to be grown in 1931 on the land described below, to secure the payment of the above-mentioned note, such chattel mortgage or crop lien to be in form supplied by the Department of Agriculture (or, in those

States in which a legal mortgage can only be given when crops are planted and growing, an agreement to execute and deliver a satisfactory crop mortgage at the proper time); and by (c) a voucher form supplied by the Department of Agriculture and signed by the applicant.

My age is years; single or married?
 number of children at home? of these
 are sons 12 years of age or over, and sons and daughters under 12 years of age.

I operate a plow farm, upon which families live.

Did you apply for a Government seed loan in 1929 or 1930?

If approved, for what amount? \$.....
 (Answer yes or no.)

Is it now paid?

(Yes or no.)

DESCRIPTION OF LAND ON WHICH I WILL GIVE A CROP LIEN AS SECURITY FOR THIS LOAN

Land owned by me

Upon that certain piece or parcel of land lying in the county of, State of, and known as the farm of, and more particularly described as follows:

I certify that my 1931 crops on land owned by me are free from encumbrances, except the following mortgages, which I have already given:

Name	Address	Amount \$.....
Name	Address	Amount \$.....
Name	Address	Amount \$.....

If share cropped, the following tenants receive share of crop:

Name	Address
Name	Address
Name	Address

Waivers from the above-named mortgagees or share croppers to the extent of the Government's lien of all right to any growing crops for the year of 1931 accompany this application. I agree to give no additional mortgages against this crop pending action of the Department of Agriculture on this application and, in the event of its approval, until the department has filed the mortgage accompanying it.

Land rented by me

Upon that certain piece or parcel of land lying in the county of, State of, and known as the farm of, and more particularly described as follows:

The land described above is rented by me from of, whose waiver to the extent of the Government lien of all right to any crops grown on this land for the year 1931 accompanies this application. This land is rented for a cash rental of \$..... per acre (or a share rental of of the crop).

I certify that my 1931 crops on land rented by me are free from encumbrances, except the following mortgages which I have already given.

Name	Address	Amount \$.....
Name	Address	Amount \$.....
Name	Address	Amount \$.....

If share cropped, the following tenants receive share of crop:

Name	Address
Name	Address
Name	Address

Waivers from the above-named mortgages or share croppers to the extent of the Government's lien of all right to any growing crops for the year 1931 accompany this application. I agree to give no additional mortgages against this crop pending action of the department on this application, and in the event of its approval until the department has recorded the mortgage accompanying it.

Is the above all of the land you will have under cultivation during the crop season of 1931? If not, fur-

(Answer yes or no.)

nish description of land not covered in this application

Have you any business other than farming

How much income do you derive from other occupations?

If loan is not granted, what farming can you do this year?

Statement of my present indebtedness

	Amount	Interest rate	Name and address of creditors
First mortgage farm loans.....			
Second mortgage farm loans.....			
Chattel mortgage loans.....			
Crop mortgage loans.....			
Store accounts.....			
Unpaid interest.....			For how many years?.....
Unpaid taxes.....			For how many years?.....
Other debts.....			
Total indebtedness.....			

Statement of livestock and equipment owned

	Number	Value
Horses and mules.....		\$.....
Milk cows.....		
Tractor.....		
Hogs.....		
Poultry.....		
Automobile.....		

Statement of my crop acreages and total production for 1929 and 1930, including both tenant's and landlord's shares

I planted the number of acres and harvested the yields stated below in 1929 and 1930. (State here the total number of acres sown and total yield of each crop produced by you in 1929 and 1930, including the landlord's share, if you are a tenant.)

Crop	Acres planted 1929	Crop harvested 1929	Acres planted 1930	Crop harvested 1930
Corn.....		bu.		bu.
Wheat.....		bu.		bu.
Oats.....		bu.		bu.
Cotton.....		bales.		bales.
Tobacco.....		lbs.		lbs.
Other crops (name crops).....				

STATEMENT OF SALE OF CROPS

The following are the dealers through whom I usually sell my crops, and who will probably handle my 1931 crop:

Name _____ Address _____
 Name _____ Address _____
 Name _____ Address _____

NOTE.—The following paragraphs must be read by or to the applicant before signing.

If this application is granted, I agree to use such seed, fertilizer, and methods of farming as are approved by the Department of Agriculture, through its local representatives. I further agree to plant a garden for home use and a sufficient acreage of feed to supply feed for my livestock. I also agree to report to the Department of Agriculture how I have spent the money loaned to me for crop production, and, if requested, will report the average yield per acre of each crop grown by me from seed and/or fertilizer purchased from the proceeds of this loan on blanks furnished for the purpose at or about harvest time.

In consideration of the United States loaning the aforesaid sum of _____ dollars, I agree to use said loan in purchasing seed of the varieties mentioned aforesaid for planting for the growing season of 1931, fertilizer for the acreages and crops specified in this application, and feed for my work stock or fuel and oil for tractors used by me for crop production.

I hereby certify that I do not have seed to sow or plant the acreage specified in this application, fertilizer to apply to the crops, feed for work stock, and/or fuel and oil for tractors, and because of encumbrances on my real estate and personal property and lack of funds, I am unable to procure the aforementioned seed, fertilizer, feed, and/or fuel and oil, and the failure to receive this loan will prevent me from farming in 1931. I also certify that I have the necessary power and equipment to prepare the land and sow and harvest the crop/crops herein described. I further certify that I am familiar with all of the conditions of this application and that the answers given are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(Signature of applicant)

Date _____

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE CERTIFICATE

The answers to the following questions are true to the best of our knowledge and belief:

1. Has the applicant the acreage for which he is asking assistance in suitable condition for planting? _____ If not, can and will he put it in condition for planting at the proper time? _____
2. Has the applicant sufficient horse or engine power and the necessary machinery properly to prepare and seed the acreage he is asking aid in seeding? _____
3. Do you believe the applicant will make every effort to produce a crop and return the money loaned and that the Government is justified in making the loan to him? _____
4. How long have you known the applicant? _____
5. We have no direct interest in the loan to be made to this applicant. _____
6. If disapproved, state reasons briefly: _____

(Signed) _____

Community Committee.

COUNTY COMMITTEE CERTIFICATE

We hereby certify that we have investigated the foregoing application; that the applicant has _____ the stated acreage fit for planting; that he has the necessary equipment; and that he has the reputation of being a _____ farmer, and has the necessary equipment.

What is his general reputation? _____

Has the applicant any basis for commercial credit? _____

Is farming his only source of income? _____

We therefore recommend that the application be granted in the amount of \$_____.

We have no direct interest in the loan to be made to this applicant.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 1931.

If disapproved, state reasons briefly: _____

County Committee.

(Do not write below this line)

The above application is hereby approved this _____ day of _____, 1931.

Representative of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I want to say just one thing more. Before I left for Washington the latter part of November I made several trips across the river into Arkansas and down the river into the State of Mississippi. It will be remembered that Memphis is right in the corner of the State. The greatest sufferers in that whole country are the colored people. The condition of many of them is pitiable, and something ought to be done.

I want to commend this letter to every Senator here. I want to commend it to the President of the United States and to the Members of the House of Representatives. It is from a man who knows what he is talking about, and it goes without saying that the \$45,000,000 which has already been appropriated can not be utilized to the best interests of those people down there under present conditions. We should change the authorization to some extent. We should add to it so as to provide that the people could get food.

It is a real situation that confronts those people. It confronts the colored portion of our population to even a greater extent than the white portion of the population. But they are all human beings. They have been seriously injured without any fault of their own. If ever a government should go to the aid of any citizen, our Government should go to the aid of the citizens, white and black, down in that part of the drought-stricken country.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES AND PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK IN TEXAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present for publication in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a resolution of the Texas State Senate requesting payment in cash of adjusted-service certificates, and another resolution by the same body requesting the representatives of Texas in the Congress to request the Federal Government to establish at least one national park in the State of Texas.

The resolution of the Texas State Senate was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Senate Resolution 26, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to pay in cash adjusted-service certificates

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, the purpose of which is to pay in cash now adjusted-service certificates heretofore issued by the Federal Government to veterans of the World War, which evidence an indebtedness acknowledged by Congress to be due these veterans represents adjusted pay which is payable in 1945, being based on \$1 per day for home service and \$1.25 per day for overseas service up to a certain maximum; and

Whereas there is now in the reserve fund of the Veterans' Bureau approximately \$700,000,000 for the purpose of retiring the adjusted-service certificates, and there will be required for the Government to raise in order to pay 80 per cent of the face value of said certificate in cash at this time about \$2,200,000,000, which the Government can borrow on its bonds at approximately 2 per cent interest; and

Whereas there is now a serious economic depression widespread over our Nation, hundreds of thousands of veterans who are holders of adjusted-service certificates and their families are in need of comforts and necessities of life, which they are unable to provide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we do hereby respectfully urge the present Congress of the United States of

America to pass and to enact into law pending measures, the purpose of which is to liquidate forthwith for cash adjusted-compensation certificates heretofore issued to the ex-service men of the World War, which we sincerely urge should be paid now instead of in 1945, when many of these men, who made almost every sacrifice, will have passed on to their reward, and that it should be paid now while so many of them are penniless and have families in distress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to each Senator and Representative from Texas in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted by the Texas Senate on January 27, 1931.

BOB BARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution of the Texas State Senate was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. (By Neal et al.)

Whereas the State Democratic convention at its session in Galveston in September 1930, indorsed as a plank in its platform a system of State parks for Texas, and calling upon the representatives of Texas in the Federal Congress to request the Federal Government to establish at least one national park in the State of Texas; and

Whereas the governor of this State, Hon. Ross Sterling, in his inaugural address reiterated the enunciation of the Democratic convention in Galveston at its September, 1930, session, as to parks; and

Whereas many of the 48 States of the Union already have established national parks within their boundaries, particularly Colorado, California, New Mexico, and Utah; and

Whereas Texas has millions of square miles of area now classified as waste land but extremely valuable for the purposes of recreation and for conservation of all forms of wild life; and

Whereas it is acknowledged and admitted that Texas scenery compares favorably with that of most any other State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Forty-second Legislature of the State of Texas, now in regular session, appeal to its Members in Congress, both House and Senate, at Washington, to use their influence with the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the end that an immediate survey be made of the scenic areas of Texas with a view of determining which area or areas would measure up to the national-park standard as to beauty, size, adaptability, and accessibility to large numbers of people of this State; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Texas Member of the National Congress and to each member of the Texas State Parks Board.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9 was read and adopted by the senate January 28, 1931.

BOB BARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

PROPOSED CASHING OF SOLDIERS' BONUS CERTIFICATES

Mr. METCALF presented a telegram from Thomas H. West, jr., of Providence, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., February 2, 1931.

HON. JESSE H. METCALF,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Absolutely opposed to any legislation for cashing soldiers' bonus certificates, believing this a far-reaching step which would eventually bring this country into far deeper depression. It would flood the country with bonds, which would be absorbed at the expense of every other security and would draw money out of every bank to such an extent that the safety of many might be questioned. Believe that the best thing for the veterans themselves is to carry out terms of bonus certificates. Local organizations are caring for those in need.

THOMAS H. WEST, JR.,
President Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co.

PAYMENT OF VETERANS' COMPENSATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. HEFLIN. I have received a number of telegrams from ex-service men in my State in favor of a cash payment of veterans' compensation certificates, and some telegrams from bankers opposing it. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATHENS, ALA., January 27, 1931.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Care United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The 120 members of the American Legion post of Athens, Ala., passed a resolution unanimously in favor of a cash payment of

the veterans' compensation certificates in full. Your assistance and support will be greatly appreciated.

M. S. KENNEMER, *Commander.*
DONALD ISOM, *Adjutant.*

MONROEVILLE, ALA., February 5, 1931.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN:

At well-attended meeting of ex-service men resolution adopted urging immediate cash retirement adjusted-compensation certificates. Resolution follows.

A. L. NETTLES,
Post Commander.

SCOTTSBORO, ALA., February 2, 1931.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

At mass meeting of Legionnaires and other ex-service men of Jackson County held Scottsboro to-day it was unanimous sentiment of those gathered that we petition our representatives in Congress to do all in their power to secure at least 80 per cent cash payment on our adjusted-compensation certificates immediately.

JACKSON COUNTY POST, No. 30, AMERICAN LEGION,
EMMETT MICHAELS, *Commander.*

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., February 2, 1931.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Poll of Alabama American Legion shows practically unanimous sentiment for 100 per cent face value payment adjusted-service certificates. Practically every Alabama ex-service man and great majority of Alabama citizenry approve this program. Urge your support with view to passing full-payment legislation. Best regards.

RUFUS H. BETHEA,
Commander American Legion of Alabama.

ENTERPRISE, ALA., January 27, 1931.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Enterprise auxiliary unit urges you demand immediate action; support World War veterans' act giving pension to widows, orphans, and service connect all disabled suffering from chronic constitutional disease up to January 1, 1925. Also pass at once reasonable hospital construction program providing hospitalization for all veterans.

Mrs. E. E. SIMS, *Legislative Chairman.*

MONTGOMERY, ALA., February 3, 1931.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Montgomery Post, No. 2, American Legion, at an assembled meeting on February 2, 1931, passed following resolution:

"Whereas our entire country is suffering from business and economic depression; and

"Whereas proposals have been made in the Congress of the United States to pay in cash at the present time the adjusted-service certificates issued to veterans of the World War; and

"Whereas such action would benefit not only holders of these certificates but the Nation as a whole by putting money into circulation and hastening a return to normal prosperous business conditions; and

"Whereas the redemption of these certificates has the indorsement of the national American Legion: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by Montgomery Post, No. 2, American Legion*, That we go on record as favoring the immediate payment of the face value of adjusted-service certificates and urge our representatives in Congress to use their best efforts to secure the enactment of legislation to that end;

"*Resolved further*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the representatives of the State of Alabama in the Congress of the United States and that a copy be spread on the minutes of this post."

W. A. GAYLE, *Post Commander.*

MONTGOMERY, ALA., February 3, 1931.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Believing that the passage of the pending bill for cashing soldiers' bonus certificates would be disastrous to the business of the country and prolong period of depression, you are respectfully urged to do everything possible for its defeat.

JOHN H. DRAKEFORD,
President Alabama Bankers Association.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., February 3, 1931.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The legislation committee of the Alabama Bankers Association is opposed to bills before Congress providing cash payment of

bonus to ex-service men on the ground that such legislation will not be of benefit to this country but will prolong the period of depression and unemployment that now exists. We hope you will oppose all such legislation.

J. C. PERSONS, *Chairman.*

VIVISECTION OF DOGS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask permission to present 25 pounds of petitions in favor of the passage of the antivivisection bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, some charming lady constituents of mine are anxious that an editorial appearing in the New York Telegram of February 2 be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York Telegram, February 2, 1931]

LEGALIZING BIRTH CONTROL

A new birth control bill is before Congress.

It was introduced by Senator GILLET, of Massachusetts. It would remove the silly Comstock laws which make it a crime for even licensed physicians to give out information on methods of birth control. It will legalize birth-control information and preparations when administered under the direction of reputable physicians and druggists, and will allow reprinting of such information which has a thoroughly sound medical origin.

Those who favor birth control can write to their Senators and Congressmen urging favorable and prompt action on this civilized and socially desirable legislation. It does not make birth control in any way compulsory. It simply makes birth control legal for those who want to employ it.

UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN MONTANA

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I send to the desk a communication addressed to myself, my colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Members of the House of Representatives from Montana. The communication is from certain labor unions at Bearcreek, Mont., respecting the conditions of unemployment in that community, and stating that unless something unforeseen happens in the next few weeks they will face misery, privation, and starvation just as farmers do in other sections of the country. I ask that the communication may be printed in the RECORD. I may say that I have communicated with the Red Cross in respect to the communication.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, Bearcreek, Mont.

To United States Senators THOMAS J. WALSH and BURTON K. WHEELER and Representatives SCOTT LEAVITT and JOHN M. EVANS.

GENTLEMEN: By direction of three local unions, composing approximately 350 members of the United Mine Workers of America, at Bearcreek, Mont., the following committees were selected for the purpose of directing attention to the true conditions of unemployment in this coal-mining community on the part of the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Montana and to ask them to include the people of this community in the relief list if aid will be distributed to those in need.

BACKGROUND OF UNEMPLOYMENT

First. Due to the introduction of modern machinery in coal mines in the past four years the miners have been forced out of employment to a great degree. That is, the coal mines using modern mechanical devices or labor-saving devices have reduced the number of men formerly employed about 48 per cent, or, in other words, out of 100 men formerly employed only 52 are left to do the work, and the machines are displacing 48 men out of 100 that were formerly employed. As to output of coal, basing our figures on the tonnage output, the 52 men under this machine system will and are producing more than the 100 men working under the human-labor system.

Second. The coal miners in this community have depended in the past on seasonable work in the fall and winter. This was true in the years gone by, but the coal miners are as hard hit as the farmers are because of the fact that when the farmers are hard hit through crop failure or any other source of failure this failure of the farmers will affect their buying power, therefore leading to a disaster to the coal miners and operators of coal mines because of the fact that there is no market for coal. Result, no work.

Third. Understanding the economic forces that control the supply of our bread and butter, we also understand that to relieve the economic pressure of unemployment the only remedy would be the reduction of working hours per day. This question, after a deep study of the coal industry, is the only solution to this great unemployment problem. To do that requires the united efforts of the coal miners, coal operators, State and National Governments, respectively.

Fourth. The above introduction will take some time to be effected; that we fully realize. Therefore for the present distress among the coal miners and their dependents the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and it expresses the full sentiment of the miners and their families:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States Senate and the House of Representatives have for some considerable time discussed ways and means to relieve the unemployed from hunger and misery; and

Whereas appropriations of different nature have been made to that end; and

Whereas, as above stated, the miners of this town and community have been hard hit by the economic crisis to the extent that out of 350 men employed in and around the coal mines only about 125 are working part time during the whole year, most of them employees of the Montana Coal & Iron Co. Employees of the Eagle Coal Co., about 125, only worked 65 days during the last 12 months, and the mine will close down February 1 or thereabouts and completely throw them out of employment for full 7 months, making a total of 65 days' work in 19 months; and

Whereas help is needed for these men and their families at once; and

Whereas the 100 members of Local Union 1729, United Mine Workers of America, have been out of work all winter and all last summer and will be unemployed all the coming seven months, making a total of 225 men out of work in a small community like this, with nowhere to go and no money to buy the necessities of life for themselves or their families, and those working part time being unable to help them; and

Whereas much has been said about communistic activities, we desire to state with full authority that no such organization exists in this community to instigate any dissension whatsoever: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon our able Senators and Congressmen, if there is any relief available for people in distress, not to forget the above-mentioned men, women, and children who, unless something unforeseen happens in the next few weeks, will face privation, misery, and starvation, just like the farmers of many States in our country; and be it further

Resolved, That we are petitioning your honorable and respective bodies of Congress with a true spirit of Americanism, with a full knowledge of conditions surrounding the people in this coal-mining community, isolated from any other activities except coal mining.

Signed, resolution committee:

JOE BOSONE, Local 858.
ROY WADSWORTH, Local 858.
JOHN BONE, Local 858.
FRANK JOHNSTONE, Local 4457.
ADAM WAKENSHAW, Local 4457.
WILLIS WADSWORTH, Local 4457.
ED BARKER, Local 1729.
FRANK DANISCHEK, Local 1729.

Respectfully submitted,

JOE BOSONE, *Chairman.*
JOHN BONE, *Secretary.*

JANUARY 27, 1931.

RED CROSS RELIEF

Mr. CONNALLY. I have received a telegram from Col. Rufus J. Lackland, president Community Chamber of Commerce, Edcouch, Tex., which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

EDCOUCH, TEX., February 2, 1931.

Senator TOM CONNALLY,

Care Senate Chamber:

Will you read the following message to the Senate and Red Cross committee? The shippers and farmers of Edcouch, Hidalgo County, Tex., can and will ship to any part of the United States, as directed by Red Cross committees, 1,000 cars first-class cabbage at \$10 per ton, with \$15 per car loading charge, f. o. b. Edcouch, and 500 cars beets, carrots, and turnips, first class, at 50 cents per hamper bushel, bulk loaded, \$15 loading charge per car, f. o. b. Edcouch. This will give our farmers a living price for their products and greatly help Red Cross feed the hungry people of the United States. This is for immediate delivery, 100 cars per day.

Col. RUFUS J. LACKLAND,
President Community Chamber of Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5818) to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries in crude

petroleum and all products of petroleum, including fuel oil, and to limit the importation thereof, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1476) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5110) to amend the act of June 4, 1924, providing for a final disposition of the affairs of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1479) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4831) to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims," reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1477) thereon.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 6032) amending section 1 of Public Resolution No. 89, Seventy-first Congress, approved June 17, 1930, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment.

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11967) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1480) thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5684) authorizing a per capita payment of \$100 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1481) thereon.

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4321) for the relief of the confederated bands of Ute Indians, located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1482) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13587) to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1483) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16078) to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1484) thereon.

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 5410) to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1485) thereon.

SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 416) further continuing Senate resolution No. 79, Seventieth Congress, authorizing a general survey of Indian conditions, reported it with an amendment, submitted a report (No. 1478) thereon, and moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEMS

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) establishing a joint congressional committee to make a

general study of the unemployment insurance systems in use by private interests in the United States and by foreign governments, reported it with amendments.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GILLET, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, February 5, 1931, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4665. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.; and

S. 5776. An act to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 6050) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way for street purposes upon and across the San Antonio Arsenal in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATFIELD (by request):

A bill (S. 6051) to further the commerce of the United States by creating the World Commerce Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 6052) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Birch Coulee, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 6053) for the relief of Judd W. Hulbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 6054) granting a pension to Nancy Ann Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 6055) for the relief of John Joseph Ames; to the Committee on Pensions;

A bill (S. 6056) to amend the law relative to citizenship and naturalization, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 6057) to amend the immigration act relative to the admission of members of the family of a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WATSON (for Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana):

A bill (S. 6058) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Treadway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 6059) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Furlow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 6060) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Mudd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6061) to prohibit wire tapping in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON:

A bill (S. 6062) granting a pension to Juriah Hyden; and

A bill (S. 6063) granting a pension to Emma Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 6064) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 6065) to convey certain lands to the State of South Dakota for public-park purposes and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 247) directing the President to proclaim October 11, 1931, "General Pulaski's Memorial

Day" for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

Mr. NORBECK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12063) to amend section 16 of the Federal farm loan act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NORBECK also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.: For a water-supply system, including the purchase of lands and/or interests in lands and/or water rights for protection thereof, fiscal year 1931, to remain available until June 30, 1932, \$50,000."

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16297) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION—THE COPPER INDUSTRY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] join with me in the introduction of a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and then I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. If it does not create discussion I shall not object.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 434) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed under section 332 of the tariff act of 1930 to investigate the differences in cost of production during the calendar years of 1928, 1929, and 1930, between foreign articles and domestic articles included in paragraph 1658 (copper) of said act, and to report thereon to the Senate as soon as practicable.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask leave to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in regard to the resolution just adopted, together with certain data prepared by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement and data are as follows:

The Hayden-Wheeler-Vandenberg resolution directs the Tariff Commission to investigate the cost of production in the United States and in foreign countries of all forms of copper mentioned in the free list of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which includes copper ore and copper in plates, bars, ingots, or pigs that now enter the American market without payment of import duty. The commission is required to report upon the differences in the cost of mining and smelting foreign and domestic copper for the last three calendar years in order to make a proper comparison between marketing conditions in periods of prosperity and depression.

The investigation could not be ordered under the flexible provision of the tariff act because there is no duty on unmanufactured copper. The resolution therefore refers to section 332 of the act which authorizes such investigations and reports to be made by the Tariff Commission upon request of the President or either branch of Congress. It is in accordance with the terms of that section that the commission has about completed a study of the comparative cost during a 3-year period of producing crude petroleum in the oil fields of the United States and Venezuela and the delivery of the same to refineries on the Atlantic seaboard.

It is expected that the investigation can be completed in ample time for the Tariff Commission to submit its report when Congress convenes in regular session next December. If a revision of any of the schedules of the present tariff law is undertaken by the new Congress, a proper foundation of facts will be laid upon which consideration of the effect of a copper tariff may be based.

There was no demand for an import duty on copper while the Hawley-Smoot bill was under consideration by Congress. No one

representing the industry appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Senate Committee on Finance asking for such a tariff. The price of copper remained at about 18 cents and did not break until after the tariff bill had passed both Houses and was no longer subject to amendment. Since that time the market price has been practically cut in half.

The resolution is sponsored by the junior Senators from three States in the Union in which have been mined about two-thirds of all American copper and which produce over one-third of the copper of the world. The copper mines in these and the other Western States are now operating at a reduced rate of production with the consequent loss of employment and wages to thousands of American miners. The principal competing mines are located in Canada, South America, and Africa, where the amount of copper produced has greatly increased in the last three years.

THE COPPER INDUSTRY IN 1930

[Press release issued by the Department of Commerce January 7, 1931]

The copper industry in 1930 was severely affected by the general world-wide industrial depression. Production and consumption, which made new high records in 1929, dropped sharply, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, Department of Commerce.

Although production and consumption in 1930 both were at a rate far below 1929, the decline in production lagged behind that in consumption, causing a substantial increase in stocks. Estimated stocks of refined copper at domestic refineries at the end of the year were the largest on record. Blister stocks, which first reflect any change in rate of production, were materially lower at the end of 1930 than at the end of 1929.

Falling consumption and increasing stocks were accompanied by a severe drop in the price of refined copper. The price held at 17.77½ cents a pound at refinery from the middle of April, 1929, to the middle of April, 1930, when it dropped 4 cents. This drop was followed by numerous others, which brought the price to a low for the year of 9.27½ cents a pound on October 23. The price jumped from 9.27½ cents a pound on November 11 to 11.40 cents a pound on November 15 and immediately started to drop again. On December 15 it was 9.77½ cents, and on December 23 it was 10.07½ cents. Imports of unmanufactured copper established a new high record in 1929, while exports of metallic copper decreased. In 1930, for the first time in 50 years, imports exceeded exports.

The smelter production of copper from domestic ores in 1930, as determined by the Bureau of Mines from reports of the smelters showing actual production for 11 months and estimated production for December, was 1,375,000,000 pounds, compared with 2,003,000,000 pounds in 1929. The 1930 production is 31 per cent lower than that of 1929 and is the smallest production recorded since 1922. The estimated smelter production from domestic ores for December, as reported by the smelters, was approximately 100,000,000 pounds, which is about 16,000,000 pounds lower than the average for the 11 months preceding.

The production of new refined copper from domestic sources, determined in the same manner as smelter production, was about 1,485,000,000 pounds, compared with 1,983,000,000 pounds in 1929. In 1930 the production of new refined copper from domestic and foreign sources amounted to about 2,230,000,000 pounds, compared with 2,740,000,000 pounds in 1929—a decrease of 510,000,000 pounds, or 19 per cent. The production of secondary copper by primary refineries dropped from 334,000,000 pounds in 1929 to about 250,000,000 pounds in 1930, or a decrease of 84,000,000 pounds. Thus the total primary and secondary output of copper by the refineries was 19 per cent lower in 1930 than in 1929, being about 2,480,000,000 pounds in the past year, compared with 3,074,000,000 pounds in 1929.

The imports of unmanufactured copper during the first 11 months of 1930, according to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce amounted to 762,913,189 pounds, a monthly rate of 69,000,000 pounds, compared with 974,312,201 pounds for the entire year 1929, a monthly rate of 81,000,000 pounds. Imports in November totaled 57,000,000. The total imports for 1930 will very likely show a decrease in quantity of approximately 151,000,000 pounds for the year, or a drop of about 15 per cent.

The exports of metallic copper during the first 11 months of 1930 amounted to 691,282,979 pounds, compared with 992,895,119 pounds exported during the entire year 1929. If the exports of metallic copper in December equal the monthly average for the first 11 months of the year, nearly 63,000,000 pounds, the total for 1930 will be about 754,000,000 pounds. Exports in November, however, amounted to about 77,000,000 pounds, and it is likely, therefore, that the total for the year will be nearer 764,000,000 pounds. In the first 11 months of 1930, 619,679,098 pounds of refined copper in ingots, bars, rods, and other forms were exported. Of this quantity the United Kingdom received 158,945,101 pounds, the highest amount; France was next with 129,135,216 pounds; Germany was third with 82,960,335 pounds; and Italy fourth with 78,774,889 pounds. In the entire year 1929 the United Kingdom received the largest amount, 207,162,835 pounds; Germany was next with 178,951,566 pounds; France was third with 177,765,152 pounds; and Italy fourth with 84,805,254 pounds. Exports of refined copper to France, Germany, and Italy in November, 1930, were at a rate considerably above the average monthly rate, whereas exports to the United Kingdom were at a rate considerably under the average monthly rate. When figures for December are added, exports to Germany will be only a little

more than one-half of exports in 1929, those to the United Kingdom and France will show decreases of nearly 20 per cent for each country, but exports to Italy will show an increase approximating 6 per cent.

Refineries reported that at the end of 1930 approximately 667,000,000 pounds of refined copper would be in stock, more than double the reserve of 306,000,000 pounds at the end of 1929. The latter quantity in turn was well over two and one-half times the amount on hand at the end of 1928. It is estimated that stocks of blister copper at the smelters, in transit to refineries, and at refineries, and materials in process of refining would be about 371,000,000 pounds on December 31, compared with 500,000,000 pounds at the end of 1929, a decrease of 129,000,000 pounds. Total smelter and refinery stocks at the end of 1930 were 1,038,000,000 pounds, representing an increase of 232,000,000 pounds over stocks at the end of 1929, but 86,000,000 pounds less than the record stocks of 1920.

The quantity of new refined copper withdrawn on domestic account during the year was about 1,277,000,000 pounds, compared with 1,779,000,000 pounds in 1929, a decrease of 502,000,000 pounds, or 28 per cent. The method of calculating domestic withdrawals is shown as follows:

New refined copper withdrawn from total year's supply on domestic account, 1929-30, in pounds

	1929	1930
Refinery production of new copper from domestic sources.....	1,983,000,000	1,485,000,000
Refinery production of new copper from foreign sources.....	757,000,000	745,000,000
Imports of refined copper (December, 1930, estimated).....	134,000,000	89,000,000
Stocks of new refined copper on Jan. 1.....	114,000,000	306,000,000
	2,988,000,000	2,625,000,000
Exports of refined copper (ingots, bars, rods, or other forms) (December, 1930, estimated).....	903,000,000	681,000,000
Stocks, Dec. 31.....	306,000,000	667,000,000
	1,209,000,000	1,348,000,000
Total withdrawn on domestic account.....	1,779,000,000	1,277,000,000

[Extract from Bureau of Mines General Report on Copper in 1928, published October 6, 1930]

The mine and smelter production figures, by States, for 1927 and 1928 are shown in the table following; in the second table following the smelter production from 1845 through 1928, by States, is shown. Arizona, Utah, Montana, and Michigan led in production for 1928 with 80 per cent of the smelter output; if the production of Nevada, New Mexico, and Alaska is added to the output of these States, 96 per cent of the output of the country is represented. In total production from 1845 through 1928 Arizona, Montana, and Michigan are especially impressive, having made 31.88, 23.64, and 19.62 per cent, respectively, of the country's total output, and Utah stands fourth with 9.80 per cent; the four States together have produced 85 per cent of the total. If the production of Nevada, New Mexico, Alaska, California, and Tennessee is added to that of the four States mentioned, 98 per cent of the country's total output is represented.

Copper produced in the United States, 1927 and 1928, according to smelter and mine returns, in pounds

State	1927			1928		
	Smelter returns	Mine returns	Rank	Smelter returns		Mine returns
				Percentage of total	Quantity	
Alaska.....	56,489,214	55,343,000	7	2.22	40,541,968	41,421,000
Arizona.....	681,168,117	682,190,547	1	40.29	735,632,406	732,276,803
California.....	25,802,603	27,133,008	8	1.35	24,707,992	25,150,743
Colorado.....	8,006,801	5,670,581	10	.56	10,262,083	8,594,646
Idaho.....	1,811,103	2,173,163	13	.13	2,336,654	2,072,165
Michigan.....	195,135,199	177,537,775	4	9.81	179,104,311	178,442,704
Missouri.....	5,041	451,000	18	930	65,000
Montana.....	225,208,853	223,492,639	3	13.75	251,046,415	248,262,027
Nevada.....	118,298,342	120,259,276	5	8.73	159,332,977	158,876,883
New Mexico.....	79,761,222	74,251,863	6	5.08	92,777,233	89,854,646
North Carolina.....	5,362,041	5,443,115	11	.45	8,207,000	8,207,000
Oregon.....	484,652	488,200	16	.02	375,049	358,463
Pennsylvania.....	2,149,182	1,735,800	12	.27	5,013,868	4,977,885
Tennessee.....	14,498,951	14,940,595	9	.90	16,374,261	16,374,261
Texas.....	25,460	21,458	15	.02	432,968	447,792
Utah.....	267,705,597	256,933,278	2	16.34	298,375,465	293,235,039
Vermont.....	238,143	208,224	14	.07	1,197,340	1,177,246
Washington.....	1,766,963	1,685,848	17	2,575	2,604
Wyoming.....	123,50901	178,898
Undistributed.....
Total.....	1,684,040,963	1,649,959,370	100.00	1,825,903,393	1,809,796,907

Copper produced in the United States, 1845-1928, by States [Smelter output]

State	Pounds	Percentage	Rank
Alaska.....	1,117,727,217	2.72	1
Arizona.....	13,085,763,760	31.88	7
California.....	1,020,999,194	2.49	8
Colorado.....	328,832,818	.80	10
Idaho.....	133,231,240	.32	11
Michigan.....	8,053,995,921	19.62	3
Montana.....	9,704,543,923	23.64	2
Nevada.....	1,582,495,103	3.86	5
New Mexico.....	1,212,851,320	2.95	6
Oregon.....	19,639,972	.05	14
Tennessee.....	519,017,000	1.26	9
Utah.....	4,023,339,370	9.80	4
Washington.....	25,367,821	.06	13
Wyoming.....	31,675,712	.08	12
Other States and unapportioned.....	192,143,656	.47
Total.....	41,051,624,027	100.00

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 12835. An act authorizing the use of tribal funds of Indians belonging on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses connected with suits pending in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11281. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 8812. An act authorizing the Menominee Tribe of Indians to employ general attorneys;

H. R. 13293. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Frazer, Mont., in the construction of a high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation;

H. R. 15263. An act to relieve restricted Indians in the Five Civilized Tribes whose nontaxable lands are required for State, county, or municipal improvements;

H. R. 15498. An act authorizing the President, through the Secretary of the Interior, to study, report, and recommend on a revision and codification of the statutes affecting the American Indians; and

H. R. 15601. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Poplar, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE AND APPROVALS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 3, 1931:

S. 872. An act to amend an act for the relief of certain tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington; and S. 5295. An act authorizing an additional per capita payment to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians.

On February 4, 1931:

S. 3938. An act authorizing the construction of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, an appropriation therefor, and the completion of the project, and for other purposes.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM LOUIS PITTHAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I inclose a report concerning a claim against the United States presented by Mr. William Louis Pitthan for services rendered as extradition agent in the matter of the application for the extradition from England of Claude W. Daniels. The report requests that the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$210 to pay the claim submitted by Mr. Pitthan.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$210 to pay Mr. Pitthan for the services rendered by him.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 1931.

(Inclosure: Report from the Secretary of State.)

RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CUTTING

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], delivered on January 31, 1931, before the Republican Club of New York on the subject of Russia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

The American policy concerning recognition of new governments was first formulated by Thomas Jefferson in recognition of the republican government of France in 1793. According to this theory, known as the *de facto* theory, any government is to be acknowledged as rightful which is formed by the will of the nation substantially declared. That will is manifested by the simple fact of control. It may be noticed that in the year preceding Jefferson's declaration the French Government had repudiated its debts, assumed power by violence, and announced a program for the overthrow of monarchical institutions elsewhere.

Jefferson's theory of recognition has been adopted and amplified by all succeeding Secretaries of State (with a few minor exceptions during the Civil War) until President Wilson refused to acknowledge the Huerta régime in Mexico. The Wilson theory that recognition should not be extended to a government which had obtained power by violence has since been completely discarded, particularly in the case of the South American revolutions last summer. The revolutionists in every case were recognized immediately. If a similar course had been followed in Russia, the Soviet Government would have been recognized in November, 1917, long before that government had adopted a policy of a repudiation of debts.

Our Government has reverted to the *de facto* theory, the traditional American theory, but still makes an exception in the case of Russia. While Mr. Colby was Secretary of State, recognition was refused on the ground that the soviet system could not possibly last. Later on, Secretary Hughes based his refusal on the ground that "in existing circumstances there is no assurance for the development of trade. It is only in the productivity of Russia that there is any hope for the Russian people, and it is idle to expect the resumption of trade until the economic bases of production are securely established." Secretary Hoover took the same ground: "Under their economic system, no matter how much they may moderate it in name, there can be no real return to production in Russia, and therefore Russia will have no considerable commodities to export and consequently no great ability to obtain imports." Few people to-day would maintain either the Colby position or the Hughes-Hoover position. After 14 years of varying fortunes, the Soviet Government has established itself as one of the emphatically stable governments of the world. And as to their possibilities of production, our alarmists are telling us to-day that, even under the inefficient communistic system, Russia is producing so much that it can dump its surplus on the rest of the world and undersell the world in its principal markets.

Out of the night of misrepresentation and failure to analyze conditions there came just one gleam of common sense, and that gleam came from President Coolidge. In his first message to Congress on December 6, 1923, Mr. Coolidge announced that if Russia would show a disposition to compensate American citizens and to recognize their debts to this country, America would be the first to go to the aid of the Russian people. He added the hope that the time was now at hand when such action could be taken.

On December 16, M. Chicherin responded to this friendly gesture by stating the willingness of the Soviet Government to discuss with this country all of the problems mentioned in President Coolidge's message. On the 18th Secretary Hughes slammed the door on both Coolidge and Chicherin by saying that there was nothing to discuss because Russia had it within her own power to comply with American desires without the need of any conference. He also referred to the question of Russian propaganda in the United States, a question which President Coolidge had not mentioned.

Regardless of the merits of Mr. Coolidge's specific conditions, it is clear that his gesture to Russia was the act of a statesman. The questions at issue between this country and the Soviet Government are so complicated and so delicate that they could hardly be settled without a conference involving full discussion and mutual compromise. It is equally clear that Secretary Hughes' refusal to enter into negotiation was the act of a doctrinaire and an obstructionist. It was, in effect, a demand for total surrender as a condition precedent to recognition. No nation with any regard to its dignity could conceivably have accepted it.

At any rate, the Coolidge gleam was quenched, and since then we have had seven years of darkness visible.

It may, of course, be argued that the question of American policy in the past is a theoretical one, and that the Bolshevik experiment is so different from others that it demands special

treatment. One often hears people ask, after exhausting all other arguments, "What good can recognition do to the United States?" The benefits which we should obtain from recognizing Russia are, of course, the same benefits which we obtain from normal intercourse with other nations. We should have diplomatic and consular representatives to protect the lives and liberties of our citizens in Russia; we should be able to promote our trade and our commerce; and we should be in a position to obtain accurate information as to the most populous country in Europe. But beyond all that, and more important than all that, we should be removing from our country the stigma of unfairness toward one particular nation. There is nothing more valuable to one's adversary than to have a just grievance. The Bolsheviks at present are suffering from a persecution mania. Nothing has done more to strengthen this than the fact that they can point to unfair treatment at the hands of the chief capitalist nation, the United States.

The main questions at issue between the two Governments at present are the Kerensky debts and the question of propaganda by the Third International in this country. On the subject of the debt we should remember that the Russian debt to the United States is an infinitesimal sum as compared with the debts which Russia owes to most of the European countries who have recognized her Government; that Russia has a very large counterclaim against this country for our armed intervention in 1918; and that the Russian Government has never announced or intimated that the Kerensky debts were not an entirely proper subject for mutual recognition.

The question of propaganda is the one on which most emphasis has been laid. Those who believe that a few agents of the Third International can come into this country and overthrow our Government by subversive writing and talking seem to show a remarkable lack of faith in the good sense of the American people. There is only one kind of propaganda which has any chance of succeeding in the long run. That is the propaganda based on facts. If Russia makes good on her 5-year plan, if she succeeds in improving the lot of the ordinary man, in increasing his real wages, and reducing his hours of work and giving him more leisure for recreation and self-development, that will be a real piece of propaganda in favor of communism. If the capitalistic countries are unable to cope with such situations of economic depression as exist at present, that will be real propaganda against capitalism.

If on the other hand we prove ourselves capable of handling our own problems, and if the Russian experiment fails, this will furnish the strongest propaganda in favor of our side. In the meanwhile the mouthings and the half-baked theories of a million agitators on either side will not affect the judgment of the American people one way or the other. "Revolutions are not carried in suitcases," said Radek. "Revolutions can not be imported; they grow." If revolution should ever come to this country, it will be because of our own failure to meet conditions. It will have no relation whatever to foreign propaganda.

The Russian experiment, like it or not, is one of the fundamental events in world history. We can not ignore it and we can not cope with it through lack of recognition or through suppression or through misrepresentation. I believe that the time has come when we can settle it by negotiation and when the problems can be straightened out as in Mexico, where difficulties of the same kind were successfully overcome.

I further believe that in such negotiations the United States will be in a position to demand a good deal. Mr. Paul Scheffer, in a recent article, has suggested that we might refuse to tolerate the existence in America of the Third Internationale, and that we might insist on the same freedom of movement for our representatives in Russia that agents of the Soviet régime enjoy in America. With regard to the Third Internationale, I confess I find it difficult to view it as a great danger in this country. It has shown itself exceedingly futile elsewhere, and I think that American conditions furnish it with far less fertile soil than it has had elsewhere. The other suggestion of Mr. Scheffer seems to me to have great merit. I think that Americans in Russia should have complete freedom of movement, freedom, if necessary, to criticize the Soviet Government and the communistic system. And I should feel no alarm at the idea of welcoming similar propaganda by the communists directed at our American institutions.

It has always seemed a strange thing to me that those who are most sure of the correctness of their own point of view are apt to be those who will least tolerate any discussion of it. It ought to be natural for one who is sure of himself to welcome every chance to present his point of view in an open argument against the opponents.

That was the theory of Jefferson and of Lincoln. Yet at present the chief argument of those who assert their belief in our institutions is to suppress the views of those who disbelieve in them.

The truth of the matter is that you can not logically say, "I am so devoted to American institutions that I shall tolerate no criticism of them." You can not say it because the right of free discussion is in itself the most fundamental of American institutions. The Constitution, to which our superpatriots are so fond of announcing their allegiance, carries in itself provisions not only for its amendment but for its own complete dissolution. The man who believes that no institution is above criticism is himself halfway toward being a bolshevist or a fascist. It is quite consistent for a communist to say that he will not tolerate outside propaganda, because the communist believes in dictatorship and in the suppression of rival theories. It was the chief merit of the founders of this country that they believed in the clash of rival opinions and that they had sufficient confidence in the wisdom of the average man to believe that in the long run truth would win.

It is impossible to spend a few hours walking through the streets of Moscow without seeing many startling things, many impressive things, many magnificent things, and many hateful things. The most hateful things to an American are the attempt to suppress individuality by molding all mankind into a common form, and the suppression of liberty by preventing free speech and free assembly and free criticism of the basis of the communist system. It is Russia's chief weakness that she can not stand criticism; that she can not afford to allow the news of the outer world to get to her people. The conception which the average Russian has of the rest of the world is even wilder than the conception which we have of what is going on in Russia. If in order to fight Russia we must imitate her principal vices and her chief weaknesses, then victory will have been purchased at too high a price.

My own belief is:

First. That we can afford to meet Russian institutions and Russian theories on the equal basis of fair discussion and competition.

Second. That our own institutions and our own economic and social theories will in this way prove themselves superior to theirs.

Third. That if I am mistaken and if communism should prove its superiority in the open market, it deserves to win out; and

Fourth. That by the clash of these rival theories it is at least possible that some new social order may arise superior in essence and in detail to either one.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SANDLIN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4, 76, and 105 to the said bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 18, 27, and 79 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3165) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and report upon a claim of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes for fair and just compensation for the remainder of the leased district lands, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2335) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list of the Navy.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 14043) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3165) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and report upon a claim of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes for fair and just compensation for the remainder of the leased district lands, which were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out all after the word "Nations" down to and including the word "just," in line 6, and insert "for"; on page 2, line 10, to strike out all after the word "paid" down to and including the word

"thereof" in line 13; on page 2, line 13, after the word "thereof," to insert "The court shall also hear, examine, and report upon any claims which the United States may have as an offset against said Indian nations but any payment which may have been made by the United States upon such claims against the United States shall not operate as an estoppel but may be pleaded as an offset"; on page 2, line 16, to strike out "six months" and insert "one year"; on page 3, line 14, to strike out all after the word "States," down to and including the word "exceed" in line 15, and insert "such sums as may be necessary not exceeding in the aggregate"; and on page 4, line 2, to strike out the word "them" and insert "such attorneys."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives. The motion was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 9, under the head "Housing Corporation," it is proposed to strike out "\$12,-180" and insert "\$17,104."

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported a bill authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000,000, as recommended by the President, to complete the construction of public buildings in various cities throughout the United States where the postal receipts exceed \$20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. The amount is \$7,500, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. On Monday last the House passed a similar bill which was referred to the Senate committee. Inadvertently the Senate committee reported the Senate bill with certain amendments. I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that it may be substituted on the calendar for the Senate bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the Senator had better defer his request until we hear from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], who is chairman of the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Hampshire is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He asked me to report the bill yesterday and requested me to take charge of the measure, because, unless the authorization provided for the bill shall be promptly made, it will be impossible to secure an appropriation to make it effective at this session. I am simply moving in accordance with the desire and request of the Senator from New Hampshire made known to me through his secretary.

Mr. McNARY. Then I understand the action proposed is agreeable to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SWANSON. I am making the request in accordance with his desire.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I feel that this is quite an important measure. All sections of the country, of course, are interested in it; and if this will not lead to any extended discussion, I shall be glad to see action taken on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether any report accompanies the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. The bill was reported on yesterday and was accompanied by a report. At that time I gave notice that to-day, or as soon as opportunity afforded, I would ask for its consideration, because the measure must be acted on speedily.

My first request is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that the House bill may be

substituted for the Senate bill on the calendar. Then I will ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in the disorder prevailing I could not follow the statement of the Senator from Virginia, and I am uncertain as to exactly what it is he seeks to bring up at this time. So, reserving the right to object, I inquire just what the measure is?

Mr. SWANSON. I will explain it to the Senator. The President recommended that the authorization for public buildings throughout the United States outside of the city of Washington be increased to the extent of \$100,000,000. Similar bills having that object were introduced in the House and in the Senate. On yesterday the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported the Senate bill instead of the House bill, which had passed the other body and been referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The bill authorizes further appropriations to the extent of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of constructing buildings outside of Washington.

Mr. WATSON. What committee reported the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds unanimously reported the Senate bill yesterday with amendments, and I am now asking for its immediate consideration.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had a meeting day before yesterday, in the absence of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Keyes]. Two bills were taken up. One of them has already been acted upon by the Senate. It had to do with cutting red tape in connection with the construction of public buildings, and the bill for which the Senator from Virginia now asks consideration is the other.

The difficulty seems to be that the House has passed a similar bill, and that bill has gone to the committee. The Senator from Virginia is asking that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill. I hope that will be done, because it will expedite the passage of the bill.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. WATSON. Are the House and Senate bills identical?

Mr. SWANSON. The House and Senate bills are identical, except the committee recommended some amendments to the Senate bill, which I will offer to the House bill when it shall be taken up for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any provision made in reference to the amount of receipts?

Mr. SWANSON. No change is proposed in the law in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, it means there will be no buildings erected where the receipts are less than \$20,000?

Mr. SWANSON. I think the present law is \$10,000. Whatever the present law is remains, for we did not think we could get through a bill changing the existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate bill is No. 5757 and the House bill is No. 16297. The House amended the bill, as it was introduced in that body to conform with the amendment

that had been agreed to by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, and if the Senate shall now pass the House bill it will conform exactly to the bill which was reported by the Senator to the Senate on yesterday.

Mr. SWANSON. It will not exactly conform because the committee added some amendments, which I will offer to the House bill, on which amendments the committee acted unanimously.

Mr. SMOOT. They were agreed to in the House. I have copies of the two bills before me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay this bill, but it seems to me, in view of the confusion that exists about it, the Senate ought not to take up a bill authorizing \$100,000,000 and pass it without anyone knowing about what the bill contains or what it proposes to do.

Mr. SWANSON. I know what it proposes to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that he wait until the pending appropriation bill shall have been disposed of, then ask for the consideration of the bill to which he has referred, and proceed with it in an orderly manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is the request now for the immediate consideration of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, consent has been given to discharge the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the further consideration of the House bill and to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill on the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consent has been granted to discharge the committee and to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill on the calendar. Objection, however, is made to the consideration of the bill at this time.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Colorado is desirous to bring up a conference report, which, of course, is a privileged matter, and I am glad to yield to him for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pending appropriation bill will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I present the second conference report on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1932. A word of explanation will probably clarify the situation, or at least enable Senators to understand just what position we are in.

The first conference report was not agreed to by the Senate. At the time that conference report was considered there were several items in disagreement. There were others from which the conferees on the part of the House were willing to recede and accept the Senate amendments, but it was necessary, under their rules, for them to take those amendments back to the House for consideration.

The principal item in disagreement, and upon which I think the Senate voted to disagree to the conference report, was that in relation to salary step-ups, so called. Whatever is done in connection with the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill as to those step-ups will be taken as a key and the same line of procedure will be followed on all of the other appropriation bills.

The step-ups included in all the appropriation bills for this year amount to \$4,265,000. The House rejected those in the Post Office appropriation bill. They further wrote into the bill the so-called Wood amendment, which would have prevented the use of lapses in making promotions and bringing employees up to the average of their respective grades during the year, so that no promotions whatever could have been made. The House has receded on the Wood

amendment, and is now willing to have the lapses used. The nearest estimate we can obtain of the total of those lapses is \$3,500,000.

The House has refused to agree to the amendments of the Senate for salary step-ups in this bill, and by a vote of one hundred and ninety odd to some forty-three, I believe, refused, under a preferential motion, to agree to the Senate contention. It was then sought to secure a vote by which the House would recede and accept the Senate amendments for the step-ups, but the leaders were unable even to get 5 per cent of a quorum necessary to have a definite vote, the House evidently feeling that the previous vote had expressed the opinion of the House definitely on that subject.

Following out the rules of orderly procedure, the first action of the Senate should be to agree to this second conference report, which still leaves in disagreement the items of salary step-ups. It would then be my purpose—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. PHIPPS. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not understand the Senator when he suggests there is only a difference of \$700,000. If there is only a difference of \$700,000, why is it that we appropriated four and a half million in these various bills? As I understand, we appropriate a total in all the several bills of four and a half million dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. PHIPPS. The amount is about four and a quarter million dollars; that is the estimate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. If the Government has plenty of money, through lapses, to pay all of it except \$700,000, why in the world did the Budget send in an estimate that it would take four and a quarter million dollars?

Mr. PHIPPS. I think the Budget was hardly justified in estimating such large amounts, for the practice has been year by year to turn back into the Treasury the surplus; that is, the unused part of the salary step-ups, which have been taken care of by these lapses. The fact is I believe that the three million and a half will be used for the purpose of making the step-ups. The lapses occur where a man who is drawing, say, a salary of \$1,800 a year drops out and a man is brought in to fill up, but in a lower position, and is paid \$1,200 a year. That leaves \$600 available to use for step-ups without drawing on the definite appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the Senate, through its committees, has provided for carrying out this law in regard to salaries in all of the appropriation bills except the Navy bill, which has not yet been heard?

Mr. PHIPPS. I think that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. All the rest of them have been heard; and the Senate committee has reported in favor of and the Senate has passed all the bills that have come before it providing for the salary increases. If we were to take this course now we would have to disrupt and undo all that has been done in all of the various bills except the Navy bill.

Mr. PHIPPS. Whatever is done in this bill, the same course will be followed with reference to other bills. The difference will be that instead of our coming up to the salary grades to the extent of 30 per cent of the total, which these steps-ups were estimated by the Budget to do, we shall have about \$3,500,000 or so, and thereby achieve 24 per cent of the step-ups necessary to bring the various grades up to their averages.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, Mr. President, that is based on an estimate as to those discontinued from the service; and it may or may not be accurate.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. My notion is that the Senate having taken this position by an overwhelming vote, as I remember—I do not recall the exact figures now, but it was quite a large vote—the Senate should not now be asked to recede from it. We have followed this course in all the other bills

except the Navy bill only; and we undoubtedly will pass the Navy bill that way, because the committee is overwhelmingly in favor of these appropriations for increases.

The fact is that we do not make the increases in these appropriation bills. The Congress has already provided for them. Our only duty is to appropriate the money for what Congress has already done. Now, why should we refuse to appropriate the money for what Congress has already done? The House has provided for it as well as the Senate.

Mr. PHIPPS. No; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House passed the law which provided for these increases. Of course they did.

Mr. PHIPPS. They passed a law providing for the increases; but the House takes the stand, which I believe is the correct one, that about 24 per cent of the increases necessary to bring the salaries up to the averages of the grades will be cared for by lapses. The House has definitely gone on record. When the Senate had its vote under which it rejected the first conference report there were other items included, such as the proposed northwestern airway, an amendment with reference to garages, and other things; and at that time the Senate did not understand the real situation with reference to these salary increases or step-ups. If we are to get together with the House at all, we must first adopt the second conference report, which, as I have explained, does not dispose of the step-ups.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the conference report be read. The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 64, 65, 66, and 68.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29, 42, 43, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 69, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For establishing and equipping a Coast Guard station at or near Port Orford on the coast of Oregon as authorized in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 958), to be immediately available, \$83,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 67.

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
REED SMOOT,
GEO. H. MOSES,
WM. J. HARRIS,
CARTER GLASS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL R. WOOD,
M. H. THATCHER,
GUY U. HARDY,
GEO. A. WELSH,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
WILLIAM W. ARNOLD,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted when the Senator was explaining what procedure he wanted to follow.

Mr. PHIPPS. My proposal is that we adopt the second conference report, which does not settle the question of salary step-ups. It settles everything else excepting seven small amendments that were complicated with the salary step-ups, but over which we would have no trouble in coming to an agreement with the House.

The adoption of that report will leave the question of the step-ups for consideration by the Senate. On some of the other items to which I have referred the Senate has receded, such as the northwestern airways route and the garage matter—amendments which were offered on the floor, and to which I could have made points of order; but in my desire to have the Senators who are interested given full opportunity to have their proposals understood I agreed to take them to conference. I refrained from making points of order. The House absolutely refuses to consider those two amendments, however.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What is the Senator's purpose, assuming that the Senate agrees to his motion? Does he propose to ask the Senate to recede on the salary step-ups?

Mr. PHIPPS. The Senator proposes to make a motion that the Senate recede. Then it will be for the Senate to decide the matter, in view of the vote that has been had in the House. I feel, and the conferees feel—they are unanimous on that point—that the proper thing is for the Senate to recede. The employees this year will receive the benefits of the Brookhart Act, which means advances amounting to four and one-half million dollars.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, if the Senate recedes on this proposal, it will recede on the proposal for all the rest of the appropriation bills—the whole question.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is it.

Mr. PHIPPS. But the lapses will be available all down the line.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the only difference between this report and the bill as it passed the Senate amounts in the whole to the difference between \$4,300,000 and \$3,500,000. That is all that is involved. The lapses take care of the difference.

The increase in the bill is \$3,500,000. That is the difference, and that is the compromise we have tried to make.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There was a great deal of confusion, and I did not hear the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, the motion before the Senate is that the Senate agree to the second conference report, which disposes of practically everything excepting the salary step-ups.

The Senator's amendment regarding garages we argued out at length in our first conferences with the House; and again, after the House requested another conference, we had it up with them. They were absolutely unwilling to accept it; and they say that if it is to have consideration it should be considered under the second deficiency bill. There, it could be brought in in order, and they might have a different attitude, although they did not show any sign whatever of yielding. They are adamant.

I assure the Senator that every effort was made to have his amendment given full consideration.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am disposed to oppose and vote against the motion of the Senator from Colorado. I can not understand that the House is justified in opposing the amendment which the Senate adopted, amendment numbered 68. I do not understand the logic of the proposal that a similar provision be attached to the second deficiency bill, because this amendment adopted by the Senate treats of the very subject upon which the Senate was voting—that is, the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of garages for a period of 10 years.

As I understand, the appropriation bill now carries that authority. That authority is going to continue under the bill, if the House prevails, without any protection whatever for the Government. In view of the testimony that has been taken, and in view of the testimony this morning of

Mr. Bartlett—who served for seven years as First Assistant Postmaster General—the Government of the United States ought not longer to tolerate the conditions that have existed for the last 10 years. We are going to do that, however, if we recede on this amendment, or adopt the conference report.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, as I have tried to state to the Senator, the conferees exerted their best efforts to secure favorable consideration for his amendment. The House conferees pointed out the fact that the amendment was contrary to the rules of both Houses. It was subject to a point of order. They even refused to take it back to the House for consideration by a vote.

When two Houses, by their representatives, try to come into accord over dozens and hundreds of items in an appropriation bill, it can not be expected that one House is going to have its way on everything. It is a recognized rule that where a House has put in new matter, or matter that is against the rules of the other House, when it comes to a final issue the House that has put in that new matter must recede. That is, and has been, my understanding.

There is nothing that can be done. We could stand here and argue until March 4, and we could not move the House on that proposition, in my judgment; and it is a waste of time to do so.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this is not new matter in the sense in which the Senator is discussing it.

Mr. PHIPPS. It was subject to a point of order when the Senator offered it. The Senator did not bring the amendment to the committee. He simply offered it on the floor. He told me the night before he presented the amendment that he would have amendments, and I asked him to let me see them as soon as possible. I had no knowledge of the amendment until a few minutes before we took up the consideration of the bill. I can assure the Senator that every consideration was shown him.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this is not a personal matter. I am not concerned personally whether this amendment is adopted or not. I am concerned only as one of the Members of the Senate in protecting the Government of the United States and its funds, and the Treasury of the United States.

This amendment is no pet of mine. The amendment grew out of the facts and circumstances surrounding post-office leases, developed during the investigation of these leases. No point of order could have been successfully made against this amendment in the Senate.

Mr. PHIPPS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BLAINE. It is an amendment that limits the use of the appropriation in identically the same language in which scores of amendments are accepted, and the Chair has repeatedly held them in order in this body. The amendment is not contrary to the rules of the other House, for the other House has repeatedly inserted similar amendments, not on the same subject but on various subjects.

The amendment provides—

That no part of said sum shall be paid as rental on the lease of any quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles—

And so forth. That is in order. It was in order in the House; and I say that the position of the House is untenable. There is no logic in it. There is no reason in it.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not wish to defend excessive leases in any way, but the thought does suggest itself to my mind that where the Post Office Department has entered into a lease for a garage for a period of years, to refuse to recognize it merely puts a burden upon the garage owner to go into the Court of Claims and sue for the amount due, and he can obtain judgment, because his claim is on the basis of a contract. Does the Senator think that we should refuse to recognize every one of these contracts?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the amendment is not aimed at past leases. The amendment is intended to affect future leases.

Mr. HOWELL. But it would affect past leases.

Mr. BLAINE. That was not my understanding at the time I offered the amendment. If that is true, it can be very readily modified by providing that any leases hereafter entered into shall contain the clauses which are intended to protect the Government of the United States. It is about future leases that I am talking.

Mr. HOWELL. I am talking about leases which have been executed.

Mr. BLAINE. I understand.

Mr. HOWELL. I think that ought to be corrected, and I assume the only possible way of correcting it is in the conference committee.

Mr. SMOOT. It can not be corrected in the conference committee, because that would be changing the action of the Senate.

Mr. BLAINE. O Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. It would be making a modification of the Senate amendment.

Mr. BLAINE. If the conference committee actually believed that the amendment adopted by the Senate relates to leases now existing, there is no reason in the world, under the rules, why the committee can not agree to the amendment with an amendment providing that it shall apply only to rentals under any lease hereafter entered into—

Of any quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles unless the lease therefor contains a provision that the lease shall be canceled whenever the Government has available a Government-owned building for the housing of Government-owned automobiles: *And provided further*, That no lease for said purpose shall be entered into until there have been competitive bids submitted under the same terms and conditions—

And so forth.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to know that the Senator from Wisconsin does not propose that the owners of these properties shall not be allowed to collect. I have no objection to the amendment, if that feature can be corrected in any way. However, I am not pointing out the way at this time.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I need not repeat what I have said, but if there is any disposition whatever on the part of the House conferees to carry out my idea, all they have to do is to agree to this amendment as amended by the suggestion I have made; that is, to make it clearly appear that it does not refer to existing leases. That was not my intention. I doubt whether it does do that; but, even if it does, it is a perfectly simple matter to accept the amendment with an amendment such as I have just suggested.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I think the matter should have been referred to the committee which would have jurisdiction, instead of being offered on the appropriation bill. But we took this question up with the Post Office Department, naturally, and they inform us that 105 leases are now in force covering post-office garages involving rentals amounting to \$1,428,000 per annum, 32 of the leases carrying an aggregate annual rental of \$1,051,000. Leases representing more than 70 per cent of the total amount contain no provisions for cancellation in the event of Government-owned buildings becoming available. The remaining leases have that clause.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. What I want to bring about is that all future leases shall contain a cancellation clause, provided that when the Government avails itself of a Government-owned building to house the motor equipment of the Government, then the lease shall be canceled. I think the testimony this morning of Mr. Bartlett, former Assistant Postmaster General, bears out the proposition that the present system is uneconomical; that it is not only uneconomical but that in fact the Government of the United States has been exploited. I simply want to prevent the future exploitation of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] ought to be agreed to in conference. There is no argument in the world which can be offered against such an amendment. The question of whether it was in order originally has no materiality here, for the reason that it is already in this bill, and it is wholly immaterial as to whether it was in order originally or not.

The fact is that the department has executed some of these leases with no cancellation clauses in them. The department should not be allowed to execute a lease with no cancellation clause in it. Of course, I make no criticism of the conferees, but I just can not understand how the conferees on either side could object to a protection of the Government's interest in that way.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are reasons why it might be inadvisable to insist upon cancellation clauses in all leases.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why? Would the Senator mind stating them? They have not been brought to my attention. I will be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. If the department could succeed in making important leases at all with the cancellation clauses included, it would obviously have to pay higher rates than under noncancelable contracts. That is evident.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me answer that.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is one reason.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. Let me answer that. There is not a city or a town in this country where garages are rented by the Government where there are not innumerable people competing to obtain such leases. The idea that they can not do it is just an idea that is gotten up by the department, and it has no substance; there is nothing behind it except an excuse that they want to do it.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLAINE. I want to point out the result of the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. I did not make a suggestion. I called attention to a statement from the department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understood.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me show how the facts are quite the contrary to that statement. These facts have been developed by the special committee.

There was Station D in Chicago, where the annual rental was \$18,000. By taking the cancellation clauses out that was reduced \$250. That is a tremendous saving for the Government, is it not?

At another station the rental was \$125,000 a year. The only consideration for eliminating the cancellation clause was \$2,500.

In another case the lease called for a rental of \$20,000 a year. By eliminating the cancellation clause the Government got the contract for \$250 a year less.

I call attention to another one, where the rental was \$120,775 a year. By eliminating the cancellation clauses the Government was permitted to pay \$120,000 a year, or only \$775 less.

Think of the great advantage it would be to the Government of the United States if it could cancel these leases when it has Government-owned buildings for the housing of automobiles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely right. I really think we should adopt another policy. We ought to adopt the policy of the Government buying the property and building these garages. It would be infinitely cheaper. I know of my own knowledge where garages have been rented at an enormous rental wholly disproportionate to what ought to have been paid, and I know that, so far as the question of getting suitable garages is concerned, there is nothing in that, because there are innumerable people who are anxious to get a contract to rent a garage to the Government.

The Senator from Colorado said there were reasons and he gave me this one. Are there any others? Let us discuss them right here and now.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I think this discussion has gone along far enough to indicate that there is great room for difference of opinion, and this matter is one which should go to a regular committee of the Senate for consideration. If it should come to my committee, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, it would be given very prompt consideration. But it does not seem to me the proper way to handle this matter is simply to ask that we accept an amendment of this nature, which, I still contend, is subject to a point of order, and try to work it out, when we find that conferees from the other body absolutely kicked it out of doors, saying that it is contrary to their rule. It was contrary to our rules, and it would be in this case, because as written it is retroactive, and would affect leases which are already in existence.

Mr. McKELLAR. That can be easily remedied by the conferees, because it is a Senate amendment, and the conferees have a right to put any kind of an amendment they desire on the Senate amendment in a case of this kind. It can be remedied by the conferees without the slightest trouble so as to meet the situation, so as to do no person an injustice, and so as to protect the Government. In my judgment, the Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely right, and this body should not yield when a measure of this kind is proposed which will protect our Government from wrongdoing.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. The Senator asked why and I gave him one reason. I can give him another out of my own head.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be delighted to have it.

Mr. PHIPPS. Assume I am the owner of a garage and the Government comes to me and offers me a 10-year lease. I am willing to make it at a lower rate if it does not have a cancellation clause in it. The Senator from Wisconsin refers to cases where very small amounts were conceded for the elimination of a cancellation clause, but in those cases the leases already had been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. PHIPPS. I have not concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just let me answer that, and I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. PHIPPS. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount of rental the Government would save by having the cancellation clause removed is very small. The Senator from Wisconsin has already given us examples. Of course, we all know that the amount is very small.

As a matter of fact, the authorization to omit the cancellation clause should never have been passed by the Congress, and I am not sure the Congress ever did pass it. But these leases were signed with that clause out, and we are in the attitude of having to back up one of our departments. The sooner we provide that we will not back them up the better. To be perfectly frank about it, I do not believe that an amendment of this kind, or a proposal of this kind, could pass in any other way except on an appropriation bill. There would be enough found on one side or the other to keep it out unless we put it upon an appropriation bill, and to my mind it is one of the most important matters we have here. We should protect the interests of the Government. There is no good reason offered here to-day why it should not be included, and I hope the Senate will vote down the conference report on this matter.

I yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. What would happen if we rejected the conference report? If the Senate refuses to agree to the conference report, we will be in exactly the situation we were in before we fought this out twice before with the representatives of the House. The conferees did not feel that it is within their province to resolve themselves into a standing committee to take up a bill, amend it, and treat it as it would be treated when it is up for consideration before a standing

committee. In a case of this kind it seems to me the matter involved is of enough importance to justify having hearings by the standing committee, where it should and would be given thorough consideration. The conferees can not do that. The conferees can not call in witnesses. I asked the department for their views and they prepared a lengthy letter on the subject. I requested that a copy of the letter be furnished the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], and they complied with my request. I wanted him to have the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not criticizing the Senator from Colorado in any way. I think he has done the best he could. But after all is said and done, the conferees have not carried out the will of the Senate.

Now, I come to the vote by which it was done. The Senator had something to say about the vote in the House. We voted in the Senate on December 20, when the conference report was turned down, and that vote is very illuminating. It showed that the Senate knew exactly what the questions were that were involved. The Senate refused to adopt the conference report. I want to refer to that vote for just a moment. I want to show how Senators voted. With exactly the same facts before them, are they going to change their votes when there is no reason for such a change?

Those voting in favor of the conference report at that time were Senators Capper, Carey, Fess, Fletcher, Gillett, Glenn, Goff, Goldsborough, Hale, Hatfield, Johnson, McNary, Morrow, Moses, Norbeck, Oddie, Robinson of Indiana, Simmons, Smoot, Steiwer, Thomas of Oklahoma, Townsend, Walcott, and Watson.

The yeas were 24. The nays were 43, as follows:

Senators Ashurst, Barkley, Black, Blaine, Borah, Brock, Brookhart, Broussard, Bulkley, Caraway, Connally, Couzens, Cutting, Davis, Dill, Frazier, George, Harris, Hayden, Heflin, Howell, Jones—

I digress long enough to say that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. JONES] voted "nay." I continue reading the nays—

Kendrick, La Follette, McGill, McKellar, Morrison, Norris, Nye, Pittman, Ransdell, Schall, Sheppard, Shipstead, Shortridge, Smith, Stephens, Thomas of Idaho, Trammell, Vandenberg, Walsh of Montana, Wheeler, and Williamson.

Mr. President, I think this is the situation confronting us:

The Congress of the United States, both the House and the Senate, with the approval of the President, passed the salary law providing for the employees of the Government, and in compliance with that law the Appropriations Committee have proposed to appropriate the necessary money to carry out the law, as it was their duty to do. The Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee. They are an appropriating committee, and that committee has in every instance at this session of Congress, except in reference to the Navy Department appropriation bill, which has not yet reached us, voted to carry out the law which the House and Senate both have approved.

But what did the House do? It voted against carrying out the law. In this conference report it insists that the Congress shall not appropriate the money necessary to carry out the law which the Congress enacted, and for that reason they refuse to do it. I say that it is the duty of the Congress to carry out its own laws. Why did we enact them if we do not expect to carry them out? Why not appropriate the money necessary to carry out the plain provisions of the act which the Congress has passed and which the President has approved?

Mr. MOSES and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield first to the Senator from Iowa, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to ask the Senator a question. I have not been informed as to whether the report changes the situation on the proposition from what it was as voted down before.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. PHIPPS. The motion before the Senate does not dispose of the step-up salary proposition at all. The matter on which the Senate conferees agreed to recede and on which they now ask the vote of the Senate has reference mainly to the garage item—

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator's motion apply only to the garage item?

Mr. PHIPPS. Oh, no; there are other items. We receded on several items and the House receded on many items. The House, since the time the Senate acted last, has receded on two additional items, but the thing to be disposed of in the second conference report would practically clear up everything except the salary step-up.

Mr. BROOKHART. I understood the Senate disagreed on the salary step-up, but the Senator will make a motion to recede upon that item?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, that brings us down to exactly where we were before, to the items on which we voted on December 20, the yea-and-nay vote being 24 to 43. The question was decided then with reference to the two items, the Blaine amendment, known as the garage amendment or limitation amendment, and the salary step-up amendment. That is exactly the same basis on which we rejected the report and which we are going to reject again unless I am very much mistaken.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield now to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I thought the Senator from Tennessee was discussing the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, but—

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished that and gone on further.

Mr. MOSES. He evidently is taking on much more territory as he proceeds with his speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just those two items.

Mr. MOSES. As to the Blaine amendment, as I tried to explain at the time the conference report was rejected, the Senate conferees receded for the plain reason that the whole subject is now under consideration by a subcommittee of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] is chairman. They had a meeting of great consequence this morning to consider certain phases of the laws which are under discussion.

The Senate conferees thought that it would be most unwise to be undertaking to deal with the situation piecemeal in an annual appropriation bill so long as the whole subject is in the hands of a subcommittee which is making a painstaking search into all the details of the subject. We felt also that the amount involved for the next fiscal year is not sufficient to warrant us in undertaking to step into a situation now under investigation. So much for that.

The Senator's statement with reference to the salary step-up as contained in the bill, and from which the Senate conferees felt themselves compelled to recede, is altogether too sweeping. The fact is that the step-ups as carried in the bill as passed by the Senate in every instance have not carried the full \$14,500,000 which is contemplated by the various classification acts.

Mr. McKELLAR. They do not do that in this bill.

Mr. MOSES. They do not. The Senate adopted in this bill the procedure advocated by the Budget and approved by the Executive of putting in one-third. When we came into the conference we found that having eliminated the so-called Wood amendment from the appropriation bills by action of the House and having continued the lapsed sums of money for promotion in every department, in this particular bill at any rate the beneficiaries of the legislation would secure substantially 75 per cent of the utmost we could get if the Senate adhered to everything it has proposed and was successful in its attempt.

But the Senator from Tennessee did not happen to be a member of the conference. I try to observe the practice which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations undertook to introduce the other day of not revealing too

much at any rate of what takes place in conference. So I will say in general terms that we might just as well have gone down and talked to the Peace Monument as to have talked to the House conferees on this subject. They insist that they have had it back before the House. They insist that they have had a separate vote on it in the House—

Mr. McKELLAR. So have the Senate conferees.

Mr. MOSES. They insist that they can not make any change in the position which they originally took. That being the situation—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. I hope the Senator will bear with me a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MOSES. That being the situation, and having already had three conferences on the subject, the Senate conferees decided, in view of the lapse of time in this session of Congress, that it would be a futility for us to pursue the matter further.

I am glad the Senator from Tennessee has adverted to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations voted to reject a conference report coming from his own committee. It is my opinion that he should not have done that—and I hope the chairman of the Appropriations Committee may give me his attention. It is my contention that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should not have voted to reject the conference report in the first instance, inasmuch as it originated in the committee of which he is chairman. We all understand the reason which actuated the chairman of the committee in voting to reject the first conference report as it came to the Senate. I think that his motives were altogether praiseworthy as the representative of a great section of the country which feels that it has not secured proper recognition in the distribution of the air mail routes. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that his own feeling about air mail routes was very considerably diluted when he discovered in the schedule of routes the one going to Memphis was taken care of.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. One moment, please. I want to say that it has not been diluted at all. We have never received any route to Memphis. The Post Office Department has never built one, and I do not know whether there is ever going to be one built.

Mr. MOSES. They can not do it unless we pass this bill, but it is on the agenda as No. 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator from Washington in just a moment. I want an opportunity to reply in my own time to the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I am not criticizing directly or indirectly the two distinguished Senators or any of the Senate conferees. I have no doubt that they did what they deemed to be best. It is a matter of opinion as to what is right.

Mr. MOSES. I thank the Senator for that expression of belief in our sincerity.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows that I believe that he is sincere, as other members of the committee are; but it seems to me that after the Senate had voted on the two propositions by a vote of 24 to 43, the conferees ought not to have to come back with a recession on the two items, whatever else might have been done, because those were the two items on which the Senate acted.

Mr. MOSES. There were three items.

Mr. McKELLAR. The other was not so important.

Mr. MOSES. It was to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to have a word to say about the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. Let me say a word first.

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. I have been associated with the Senator from Washington for 14 years. I have been on committees with him for a number of years. If ever I knew an absolutely fair, square man, an honest and sincere man, a man who looks after the very best interests

of the Government, a man who as a rule knows his duty and undertakes to perform it, let criticism go where it may, that man is WESLEY L. JONES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I join in the high praise of the Senator as uttered in regard to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] voted against this report because he did not in his conscience approve it. I think also that is the reason that actuated all of us who have opposed the adoption of this conference report. I am not criticizing those who take another view, but I know they are wrong. Now I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Of course I appreciate very much the kind words of the Senator; but I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if the item for the air-mail line along the northern border had not been in the appropriation bill I would have voted as I did. Not only did I believe in the action taken by the Senate, but, because the sentiment of the Appropriations Committee seemed to be practically if not entirely unanimous in favor of the provision, I felt it ought to be put in and that recession should not be made at that time. I will say frankly to the Senator that was my belief and my attitude. My attitude, I will say, will be a little different now, but that I shall state a little later on. That was the basis of my attitude before. Personally, I believe in the increase; I felt that the committee was practically unanimous in favor of it, and because of that unanimity of the committee I did not think recession should be made so quickly, anyway.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, the Senator from Washington has, indeed, stated accurately the sentiment that existed in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOSES. The Committee on Appropriations included the item of \$750,000 for the establishment of this air mail route because a mere glance at the map as submitted by the Senator from Washington must have been convincing. We were, however, at all times—and the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Tennessee will bear me out in this statement—embarrassed by the fact that the Post Office Department had totally omitted any reference to the northwestern air mail route at all in its estimates and in its statements before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. And, Mr. President, not only had they totally disregarded the northwestern route but they had totally disregarded the great central route to which the Senator referred a few moments ago, the route going through Memphis, and they still have done it.

Mr. MOSES. They have put it as No. 1 on the agenda. I can not go any further than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Being No. 1 on the agenda, and having an air mail route, are two very different propositions, I will say.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no—

Mr. McKELLAR. We have not obtained the route, though it has been promised us for more than two years.

Mr. MOSES. With the \$20,000,000 appropriated for air mail, and the route being No. 1 on the agenda, it is bound to come along. I want to say to the Senator, however, that the main item of contention between the Senate and the House is with reference to the step-ups in salaries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. MOSES. I share with the Senator from Tennessee the conviction that when Congress has provided by statute a salary for a public officer Congress should further provide by appropriation for paying that salary.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy the Senator agrees to that.

Mr. MOSES. But the Senator from Tennessee knows even better than I, because his service in both branches of the Congress has been much longer than mine, that that has not been the practice. Years ago the statutes used to provide the salaries for various persons in the executive departments, and no less a Democrat than Samuel J. Randall

procured the adoption of an amendment to a general appropriation bill which provided that "hereafter such sum of money as may be appropriated by Congress shall be deemed in full satisfaction of any salary authorized by the Congress." The result was that for years the city of Washington resounded with the anguished shrieks of high officials in the executive departments whose salaries had been authorized at \$5,000 a year but for whom Congress appropriated \$4,000 a year. However, under the Randall amendment, which having contained the word "hereafter" is still the law, they had to take whatever Congress appropriated.

The House knows that situation perfectly; the House conferees know it with extreme accuracy, and are able to state it with the utmost vigor. That constituted the situation in which the Senate conferees found themselves. We could not see the legislation fail, because, no matter what the Senator from Tennessee may feel, the conferees on the part of the Senate are not eager for an extra session of the Senate or of the House or of either branch of Congress separately, independently, or jointly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire; I always do; he always talks interestingly, but certainly not in this case convincingly, in so far as I am concerned, for this reason: Suppose a conference committee were to bring in here a report providing that the Supreme Court judges of the United States should receive only three-quarters of their authorized salaries or that the President should receive only two-thirds of his or that Representatives in Congress and Senators should receive only one-half of theirs, there would be a howl that would go up that would prevent the adoption of any such conference report.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment.

Mr. MOSES. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question right there.

Mr. McKELLAR. One moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. While we do not do that and no one would propose to cut off the salaries or a portion of the salaries, yet in the case of the subordinate employees of the Government, those who are drawing small salaries, those who I have no doubt are having a hard time to make buckle and tongue meet on their small salaries, we do not hesitate at all to chop off a part of their compensation. I do not think that is fair. If we want to take vengeance on the smaller-salaried employees of the Government let us do it by act of Congress. Congress by proper act has provided for giving them what it thought they were entitled to; it has fixed their salaries, and it is the duty of Congress, having fixed them, to pay them. It is just as unjustifiable to deny these employees their proper salaries as it would be to deny the higher officers of the Government a portion of their salaries. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator states a hypothetical case which is far afield from the real facts. It so happens that one House fixed the rates of salaries at one figure, and when the bill came to the other House the rates were increased.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; just a moment—

Mr. MOSES. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Congress of the United States in an act duly passed and signed has provided for those step-ups.

Mr. MOSES. It was an authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was an authorization, but Congress fixed the amount, and it is our duty to appropriate the money to carry out the act of Congress. If it were not so, a point of order could have been made against this provision.

Mr. MOSES. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, no point of order has been made.

Mr. MOSES. There was a mere authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. A mere authorization.

Mr. MOSES. In the consideration of an appropriation bill the question arose whether one House or the other or

both Houses in unison should act under the full authority of the authorization. One House refused to act under the full authority, while the other House decided that it would act to the limit, and that presented the issue between the two Houses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MOSES. Just a moment. Let me finish.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is speaking in my time.

Mr. MOSES. What does time mean to a United States Senator? Nothing at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MOSES. Very well; the Senator can ask it in my time if he is fussy about time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose the Congress should authorize the Government to pay Senators and Members of the House \$15,000 a year and a bill were brought in here from a conference committee cutting it down to \$10,000 or to \$5,000, would the Senator be in favor of it?

Mr. MOSES. I have no doubt that I would shriek as loudly as some of the employees of the Government working here in Washington are shrieking about this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, let us be fair to them.

Mr. MOSES. I have not denied them the right to complain.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know we do not deny them that right, but do not deny them the salaries Congress promised to pay them. Of course, they can complain under the Constitution.

Mr. MOSES. Congress did not promise to pay them; Congress authorized succeeding Congresses to pay them if they would appropriate the money; that is all there is to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true also in the case of salaries of Senators and Members of the House and judges of the Supreme Court and the President himself.

Mr. MOSES. To get down to the practical question this is what it resolves itself into: We have not provided the ultimate salaries authorized in the various classification acts; we admit that; we have given the employees a portion of those salaries; we have given them a very considerable portion of them; and the argument at the other end of the Capitol, as expressed on the floor in the other branch and as expressed in the conference committee, has been that under all the circumstances, inasmuch as we have given them so much, so great a percentage of the total increase to which they might go under the authorization, we have done all that we should under the present circumstances.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the fact that in the discussion of this matter in conference the House receded from its position that no portion of the lapsed appropriations should be used for making the step ups. They having done that, we are able to provide substantially three-quarters of all the increases which the employees could have if they had obtained everything.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I said before—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JONES. The case I am about to cite will exemplify the contention of the Senator from New Hampshire. I remember that years ago the law provided that the salary of the surveyor general of the State of Washington should be a certain sum, but I know that all the time I was in the House, and I think after I came to the Senate, the appropriation for that salary was fixed at a considerably lower figure. The surveyor general never got the amount the law authorized him to receive, because the Congress refused to appropriate it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not think that is a parallel case; that might have been done as to one individual, but in this case are involved practically all the subordinate employees of the Government whose salaries are provided for in these various appropriation bills. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate provided for all

these step-ups, I believe, without a single protest; if there was an adverse vote I do not remember it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. I do not say that there was no vote against it. It was not a question on which no adverse votes might have been cast, but I do not recall any. The Senate voted by a yea-and-nay vote 43 to 24 to provide for the step-ups; and it does not seem to me, after the Congress has directed us to do it by proper authority, that we ought to change our position.

Mr. MOSES. But the House has voted since we did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose they have. They voted not to carry out their own law, and that is an untenable position, in my judgment. The Senator from New Hampshire thinks it is a tenable position; that it is perfectly right for the Congress to fix the salaries of the subordinate employees and then not pay what it authorized them to be paid. The Senator thinks that is all right, but I do not think so.

Mr. JONES and Mr. GLASS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I want to say that I did not cite the example I gave a moment ago to refute the merits of the proposition, but simply as a concrete example illustrating the idea for which the Senator from New Hampshire has contended.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. The situation is simply this: As I understand the contention of the Senator from Tennessee, because the Senate conferees could not prevail upon the conferees of the other House to give the entire amount provided in the authorization, the Senator from Tennessee is not willing to give the two-thirds that the Senate prevailed upon the conferees of the other House to accept.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; that is not my position at all. My position is that it is our duty to carry out the law of the land that has been duly passed to give these people certain salaries. It is our duty to carry out that law and give them the salaries. That is my position.

Mr. GLASS. If the conferees of the other House do not see their duty as we see it, will the Senator suggest how we can compel them to do it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite confident that if the Senate takes the same position that it did before, the House will then pass upon it, and let us see if we can not get together.

Mr. GLASS. As a matter of fact, I want to state to the Senator that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] was the most insistent and persistent of the conferees on the part of the Senate for the full amount.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator might add "insolent."

Mr. GLASS. We simply could not get it, and did not get it, and it is my view that we will not get it; and it seems to me that in the last analysis the Senator from Tennessee is taking the position that if we could not get all we wanted, these employees may not have the two-thirds that we did get for them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; I can not be put in that position. I have already stated this, so there is no use of stating it again; but I want to say that I hope nothing I have said here is a criticism upon my part of any of the conferees at all. I am not doing that. I know what the troubles of a conferee are. I know how difficult is his position.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may interject right there, as one of the conferees from this side of the Chamber I am perfectly willing to retire and have the Senator from Tennessee substituted in my place, if he thinks he can do better than I did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; I know I could not do half as well, so I will not undertake it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator a few minutes ago made a suggestion which seems to me to be interesting, and probably likely to prove fruitful. He insists that it is the duty of Congress, an authorization having been established, to go forward to the full extent.

There are some authorizations that have already been made for various subjects, and I will take them up as they come before us; and I want the Senator from Tennessee to stand foursquare on the proposition that an authorization for an expenditure having been made, it is our business to go forward with it, because we shall have some naval bills here presently.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not recall that I have ever lain down or sat down on what I conceived to be the carrying out of the law. I have always tried to stand up for it under all circumstances.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to get this situation straightened out a little bit.

The argument is made that this appropriation by the Senate would comply fully with the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. The Senate has only asked about one-third of immediate compliance with the law has it not? Is not that the situation?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; that is not the practical situation, Mr. President.

To begin with, the Budget sent up here a proposal that we should do this under a 3-year program. Along with that, the House adopted what is known as the Wood amendment, which also struck down the use of the lapsed money. Through our insistence that was rejected. There also remained a certain sum of money for automatic increases, which we could not interfere with at all. The result is that two-thirds of everything that could have been had under the Budget recommendation is now contained in this bill.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, it is not merely two-thirds; it is 80 per cent.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Colorado corrects me and says it is 80 per cent.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Budget, then, did not estimate for all of this advance that has been authorized by law?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no! The Budget took the position that the total advance, which would aggregate \$14,500,000, should be spread over a 3-year period; and that is what the Senate acted on.

Mr. BROOKHART. And if it had done as authorized by law, the whole \$14,000,000 would be in this bill now.

Mr. MOSES. If the complete authorization had been carried out, not this bill alone but all the bills, affecting all the executive departments, would have carried \$14,500,000.

Mr. BROOKHART. That is what I think ought to have been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just one other word to say.

I have been interrupted very frequently, and have taken a great deal longer than I intended; but I want to say that there seems to be a very sincere and honest difference of opinion, and I am in favor of giving to these employees the largest amount possible under the circumstances after the Congress has authorized it.

With the authority of Congress, with the law, we have nothing to do. As an appropriations committee and as the Senate or as the House we either ought to furnish the money or we ought not to. I think we ought to furnish it.

We would not even undertake to follow this course with any other officers of the Government. Take the higher officers of the Government, those getting bigger salaries. We would not think for a moment of cutting off a part of their pay; and yet that is what we propose to do for those

with smaller incomes coming from the Government. I do not think it is justifiable, and I propose to vote against the amendment.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, do I understand that the conferees have agreed on this salary question?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have done this: The present motion is to agree to the conference report, under which the Senate concedes the Blaine amendment.

Mr. PHIPPS. And the air mail amendment, and several others.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then it is proposed by the Senator from Colorado to make a motion to the effect that the Senate recede on the salary schedule.

Mr. MOSES. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those are the two questions before us.

Mr. DILL. I take it that the report also strikes out the amendment for the northern airway.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is what I stated.

Mr. MOSES. But that is cared for in another way, as the Senator's colleague [Mr. Jones] can explain to him.

Mr. DILL. It is not cared for by providing for it. It is cared for by providing that we will get it some time in the future.

Mr. MOSES. Well, we all live and hope.

Mr. PHIPPS. The first step is provided for.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I want to talk about another matter for just about five minutes, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment? While I think probably this is not in strict conformity to the rules, I should like to get the urgent deficiency bill to the President as soon as possible; and I think it will take only a minute to do that.

Mr. PHIPPS. Will the Senator yield for just one moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. The Senator made a remark about the Senate cutting down salaries. There is quite a difference between cutting down or reducing a salary that has been enjoyed and refusing to give an increase on a salary that has been paid right along. We are refusing to give increases, except to a certain extent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think every Senator understands that situation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the urgent deficiency bill, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 5, 1931.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4, 76, and 105 to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the first line of the matter inserted by said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 79 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including the purchase and distribution of medical sup-

plies, in the drought-stricken areas, and including personal services, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation unless the State, county, or municipality affected agrees to pay such proportion of the expenses of such demonstration work, as shall be required in regulations to be prescribed by the Public Health Service, in which due consideration shall be given to State and local economic conditions and human needs, the extent and circumstances of such cooperation in each case to be reported to Congress at the beginning of each regular session."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there are three amendments to which the House has agreed with an amendment. They are as follows:

Amendment numbered 18, with reference to reclamation, where the time is made two years instead of five.

Amendment numbered 27 merely strikes out a heading in the bill.

Amendment numbered 79 is the health proposition, upon which we tentatively agreed.

I move that the Senate agree to the amendments made by the House to amendments numbered 18, 27, and 79.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope they will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	King	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	La Follette	Smoot
Black	George	McGill	Steiner
Blaine	Gillett	McKellar	Stephens
Blease	Glass	McMaster	Swanson
Borah	Glenn	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Goff	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Goldsborough	Morrow	Townsend
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Tydings
Bulkeley	Harris	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Walcott
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hawes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Waterman
Couzens	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Cutting	Heflin	Ransdell	Wheeler
Dale	Howell	Reed	Williamson
Davis	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	
Deneen	Jones	Sheppard	
Dill	Kean	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, this conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, as agreed to by the conferees, strikes out the appropriation of \$750,000 which would have provided a northern air mail route from St. Paul to Puget Sound. I have caused to be placed on the wall of the Chamber a map in order that I may call the attention of the Senate to the unfair treatment that is being meted out to the people of the northwestern part of the United States in the use of money provided to establish and maintain air mail service.

The black lines shown on the map of the United States indicate the existing air mail lines. It will be noted that they reach every section of the United States and give direct air mail service within at least 200 miles of practically every location of importance in the country with the exception of that section of the country extending from St. Paul west to Puget Sound. There are three transcontinental air mail routes running from the eastern part of the country to the Pacific coast, one by way of Chicago, Des Moines, Cheyenne, Salt Lake City, and Reno to San Francisco; another by way

of St. Louis, Oklahoma City, Amarillo, Albuquerque, Winslow, and Los Angeles; and another by the way of Atlanta, Fort Worth, Dallas, El Paso, Tucson, Phoenix, and Los Angeles. But the northern half of the country has no air mail route at all. We are supplied by little branch lines which run up to us as though we lived in a pioneer country.

If we were confronted in this situation merely with the theory that there were to be no extension of air mail routes, because of the lack of funds, that would be one thing; but that is not the case. About \$1,500,000 is added to this appropriation this year for new air mail routes or additional air mail routes, and instead of providing this northern line, as could be done with \$720,000, the department has put in line from Kansas City to Denver, another line from Pueblo to El Paso, another from Pueblo to Fort Worth, another from Fort Worth to Louisville, another from Pittsburgh to Norfolk by way of Washington, another from Richmond down along the Atlantic coast to Jacksonville, and another from Greensboro to Columbia and Augusta.

I am not complaining of the fact that those towns are to receive additional air mail service, but I am complaining of the fact that those communities, which are already most of them served by direct air mail lines and some of them by transcontinental lines, are to have additional air mail service provided from other towns, so they will have more complete service, while that portion of the country from St. Paul to Puget Sound is left without any air mail service at all.

It is significant that the additional lines to be established are all extensions of existing routes. The northern line would be a new route. Extension lines are provided for by present contracts to those now holding contracts. New lines are open to competitive bidding. I have good reason to believe the Post Office Department does not want to establish new lines where bidding may interfere with the development of the air mail monopoly that is fast forming.

It is said by the Post Office Department officials and those who oppose the establishment of this line that this is a thinly, sparsely settled section of the country; that it is not ready for such a line. I invite attention to the density of settlement there is across from Lincoln, Nebr., through Rock Springs and Nevada and thence to San Francisco. I call attention to the thinness of the settlement from Albuquerque to Los Angeles and on the southern routes. The truth of the matter is that there is no route from the eastern part of the United States to the Pacific coast but what traverses a more sparsely settled part of the country than that which would be traversed by the route from St. Paul to Puget Sound.

All we are asking is that we be treated as though we are a part of the United States and not a territory. All we are asking is that these communities and towns shall be given air mail service as are the other towns and communities of the United States. If the Post Office Department thinks there is such need for additional service as to make the extension into the communities where air mail service already exists, then certainly we believe we are entitled to have a route from St. Paul across the northern part of the United States.

I know the probable thought in the minds of some Senators is that the north country is a country through which it is difficult to fly. In the first place, I invite attention to the fact that the crossing of the Continental Divide in Montana is at a lower elevation than on the other transcontinental routes. The elevation there is 6,300 feet. If we are told it is not feasible because of the severe winter weather, then I invite attention to the fact that the Post Office Department itself is extending an air mail service from St. Paul to Winnipeg, which is to traverse a much colder country than much of the territory to the west. Already they operate the line from Boise to Great Falls, along the backbone of the Rockies almost to Canada.

We are told there is a lack of landing fields. I call attention to the towns having air fields. Beginning with St. Paul, which has one of the best airports in the country, we find an established airport at Aberdeen, S. Dak., another

field at Miles City, another one at Billings, and another one at Butte, Mont. We find another one at Missoula, one at Spokane, and one at Seattle. Those are developed airports. The fact of the matter is that the cities along this route have spent \$10,000,000 establishing air fields and airports. That is a much better condition of affairs from the standpoint of starting an air mail route than was provided previous to the starting of the other transcontinental routes. Not until after those routes were established was a complete line of airports provided.

I call attention to emergency landing fields at a distance of almost every 30 or 40 miles along the route. They will be found at Montevideo and Wilmar, Minn.; Aberdeen, Mobridge, Lemmon, Hettinger, and Sagmiller, N. Dak.; Baker, Miles City, Forsythe, Billings, Laurel, Big Timber, Livingston, Belgrade, Three Forks, Butte, Helena, Deer Lodge, Great Falls, and Superior, Mont.; Kellogg, Wallace, and Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Cheney, Harrington, Waterville, Wenatchee, Ellensburg, and North Bend, Wash. This gives a complete line of emergency fields across the country in addition to the regular airports at the larger cities.

I mention these facts because it has been argued that that section is not ready to put in an air mail route. Of course, if the department is going to take the position that we must have the airways established, that we must have the lighting system in operation, and must have a completely established system of airports before they will establish a route, then their contention is good; but the department has not required that on the other routes. They have not required such conditions until after the routes were provided for and established. We believe it is only a fair and decent request that we make that the part of the country from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Puget Sound shall be given similar treatment in the matter of air mail service to that given every other part of the United States.

It may be asked whether or not the route is well known to pilots and has been flown over regularly. In June of this year a passenger service was established from Seattle to St. Paul by N. B. Mamer, of Spokane, Wash., three times per week each way. Every other day the line runs each way. The line from Spokane to Seattle runs every day. They found no difficulty at all in the daylight service they have there. It is proposed, by those of us who favor the establishment of this route, to provide the \$720,000 for its establishment. By putting some lights at either end of the route the daily air mail service can be handled by daylight for the coming summer, and by winter, night service can be provided. The air mail time from Seattle to St. Paul will be only 10 hours.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the distance covered by the proposed route?

Mr. DILL. I think the distance is about 1,800 miles. I am not certain as to the exact distance, but it is the longest single strip; in fact, the only great strip of country in the United States that is not provided with air mail service.

I invite attention to the fact that there is a route, a sort of branch line, from Salt Lake City up to Great Falls. They have run a line up to Pasco and Portland, a branch line to Spokane, and another line from Portland up to Seattle. Thus those cities get air mail service as branch-line cities. They do that to meet temporarily, they say, the needs of the situation. We accept that as better than nothing, but we believe the people of northwestern United States are entitled to the same kind of treatment across the northern section of the country that the Government has given to all other sections of the western country. We have three transcontinental lines running across the southern half of the western country and none across the northern part of western United States. It seems to me there can not be any defense for this treatment.

I dislike to ask the Senate to vote down the entire conference report, but there is no other way to meet the situation and secure justice under our rules. Unless we do vote down the conference report there is no way by which the situation can be handled. We are told we will get it some

time in the future. Other sections of the country have not had to wait until some time in the future. Other sections of the country have air mail service now. With the comparatively small additional expense of \$720,000, it seems to me we are justified in insisting that the conference report be rejected and the conferees instructed to insist upon the amendment.

I call attention to another thing about weather conditions. A five years' study of weather conditions along the northern route shows that there are lower temperatures during the winter along the central transcontinental route running from San Francisco to Chicago by way of Salt Lake City and Des Moines than there are along the route from St. Paul to Seattle; that there are more clear days along the northern route and that there is less precipitation in the cities along this route; so the argument which has been suggested that the weather conditions made it more difficult is not based upon the facts.

The air mail system of the country is almost completed, except for a few small extensions. If we do not secure this route now for the Northwest, we have no assurance when we shall secure it. Our demand for equality of treatment is just. That section has waited patiently while all other sections were being provided with air mail service. I ask the Senate to vote down this conference report and thereby declare to the conferees that the northern air mail amendment must be included in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD a petition to establish this northern air mail route from Tacoma, Wash., to St. Paul, Minn. It contains a considerable amount of data on the subject as prepared by those who are interested. I think it will be quite informing to the Senate and to those who read the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PETITION TO ESTABLISH A NORTHERN AIR MAIL ROUTE FROM TACOMA, WASH., TO ST. PAUL, MINN.

To the honorable POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the undersigned petitioners, respectfully represent that the above northern air mail route may be effectively described as follows, to wit:

A route extending from Tacoma, Wash., to St. Paul, Minn., via Seattle, Wenatchee, and Spokane, Wash.; Coeur d'Alene, Kellogg, and Wallace, Idaho; Missoula, Butte, Bozeman, Billings, and Miles City, Mont.; Aberdeen, S. Dak.; and Minneapolis, Minn.

That the northern route passes through the most densely populated areas of Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, and follows ideal flying country through broad open valleys, avoiding any extended mountain areas.

That all the principal cities along the route have adequate airports, and there are emergency fields spaced at approximately 30-mile intervals along the proposed route.

That there is an economic need for an air mail transport service, and the present air mail feeder lines serving this territory are entirely inadequate and provide no saving in time between the Twin Cities and the Northwest.

That the greatest volume of mail and passenger movement is east and west, while the present air mail feeder lines run north and south.

That the northern tier of States need an east-west airway to keep in pace with the progress and development of the rest of our country, so adequately served by regular scheduled air mail transport lines.

That air transport operations conducted over this airway since May, 1930, have proven that a regular 12-hour schedule can be maintained between Spokane and the Twin Cities, and with a lighted airway and faster equipment, an overnight schedule can be flown between Seattle and the Twin Cities.

That past operations over the northern route, as well as operations conducted at both ends and the middle of the airway, prove the route to be feasible and practical for year-around operations.

That your petitioners have prepared a detailed report and survey on the proposed northern air mail route relating to the following subjects: History, terrain, weather, present development of northern airway, scheduled operations, and air mail. Said report is attached hereto and by reference made a part of this petition.

In view of the facts disclosed by said report and survey indicating feasibility, practicability, and necessity of northern air mail route, we, your petitioners, do therefore pray that a northern air mail route be immediately declared established over the above-described airway, and that appropriations be included in the 1931 Budget for its immediate development.

REPORT AND SURVEY ON PROPOSED NORTHERN AIR MAIL ROUTE—
HISTORY, TERRAIN, WEATHER—PRESENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE
NORTHERN AIRWAY—SCHEDULED OPERATIONS—AIR MAIL

By Newton Wakefield

THE NORTHERN AIRWAY—SEATTLE-ST. PAUL

History

The idea of a northern airway was conceived during the national air races in the spring of 1927. Air races were held between New York and Spokane and national publicity was given to this new airway from St. Paul to Spokane—the shortest possible air line between the rich Northwest and the large eastern centers of population. The derby races struck a responsive chord, ringing with enthusiasm and cooperation in the hearts of the people in the northern tier of States where, probably more than in any other section in the United States, there is an appreciative understanding of the value of rapid and efficient transportation; and now three years later this continued determination for the ultimate adoption of the northern airway as part of the Federal Government system of airways is shown by the fact that over \$5,500,000 has been invested in landing fields, equipment, and general aeronautic development by cities along the route from Tacoma, Wash., to the Twin Cities in Minnesota.

It is doubtful if any part of the United States has so efficiently developed an airway for ultimate adoption by the Federal Government at a minimum cost as the northern airway. Repeated military and commercial flights over the route have definitely proved its all-year feasibility. Even the scores of air-derby racers in 1927 found no difficulty in flying the northern airway, even at the time when there were no developments along the route.

One of the most important factors in developing the airway was a survey tour in the spring of 1929. The itinerary included all the towns along the northern airway as well as adjacent towns along the route. The trip was carefully planned, and an advance party was sent ahead of the Ford plane to create publicity and to develop the fields at each particular town which would be suitable for accommodating the 12-passenger Ford plane used on this trip. Through publicity and propaganda this tour created a tremendous amount of interest in aviation and in the northern airway. During the trip, which lasted approximately three months, more than 20,000 people were carried in the Ford plane on short sight-seeing flights around their cities and adjacent country. This tour was not only instrumental in creating public interest in flying and the northern route but in developing and improving airports and flying fields along the entire route from Seattle to St. Paul.

Realizing the necessity of a known airway into the Northwest in case of an emergency, the War Department ordered Major Royce, past commander of the first pursuit group, Selfridge Field, to take his squadron of pursuit planes across the northern border States during the most severe winter flying conditions. Although delayed because of their lack of equipment to start all 18 Curtiss water-cooled motors under subzero weather conditions, the planes witnessed no difficulty in landing and general weather flying conditions over the northern airway.

This summer N. B. Mamer demonstrated the feasibility of a 10-hour flying schedule between Seattle and St. Paul by flying a round trip between these two cities in 20 actual flying hours. One leg of the flight was made at night over an unlighted airway, and proved conclusively that a regular 10-hour night schedule between Seattle and St. Paul was possible with the present day flying equipment, provided the airway was lighted.

The interest and cooperation of the people along the route as demonstrated during the Ford tour was so encouraging that a private company decided to make a thorough engineering and traffic study of the route to determine its practicability for a passenger air transport line between St. Paul and the Pacific Northwest. The survey and study required one year, and justified in every way the establishment of an air transport line over this airway.

Prior to the inauguration of the passenger line, and as a final study of cooperation and interest that might be expected along the line, a good-will party was organized in the early part of April, 1930, to fly over the northern route, stopping at all the principal cities. The party consisted of civic leaders appointed by the various chambers of commerce to represent their city. The interest and enthusiasm shown in the towns along the route were almost overwhelming and justified beyond any doubt the conclusion previously drawn from the engineering and traffic study of the route for the establishment of an air transport line.

After the good-will trip preparations were made, and the first air passenger line was inaugurated between Seattle and St. Paul June 9, 1930. From that date until the present time a triweekly service has been maintained between Spokane and St. Paul and daily service between Spokane and Seattle over the northern airway.

During this period efficient service and public interest have prompted the improvement of all important airports along the line, and the development of additional emergency fields that are required for safe and efficient operation.

Terrain

That part of the airway extending from St. Paul to Miles City, Mont., with the exception of about 100 miles of terrain known as the Bad Lands, lies over flat, level agricultural country which presents no more difficulty geographically or from the standpoint of weather conditions than the airways over Illinois, Ohio, or any of the Prairie States over which planes are flying daily along the present established airways. The Bad Lands are a low range of

broken up hills, interspersed generously with good natural emergency landing fields and offer no barrier whatever to flying.

From Miles City westward the route follows generally the Yellowstone Valley, which affords ideal flying country, avoiding passage over rough, inaccessible country or the crossing of any timbered sections or mountain ranges until about 5 miles east of Butte. At this point the Continental Divide is crossed over a low pass, requiring a minimum altitude of 6,300 feet for safe passage, which, incidentally, is the maximum altitude necessary for passage over the mountains along the entire route. The divide breaks off abruptly on the Butte side, and crossing of the pass takes but a few minutes.

From Butte to Missoula ideal flying country prevails, avoiding all rough terrain by following the Northern Pacific Railroad through a valley. From Missoula to Spokane the alternate of two routes is offered, one to St. Regis and Wallace, which is the most direct, but necessitates flying over about 35 miles of heavily timbered country; the other to Thompson Falls and Sandpoint, Idaho, following the Northern Pacific, avoiding all mountains and considered ideal flying country, but adding 25 or 30 miles to this leg of the route. The course from Missoula to Spokane via Wallace and St. Regis Pass, although it finds its way along valleys through the heart of the mountains, there is no time when a safe landing can not be made from 2,000 feet altitude.

West of Spokane the country is flat and open to within 75 miles of Seattle. From Easton, on the east side of the Cascade summit, to North Bend, on the west side, is about 25 miles. This is the longest distance over the entire route where a landing field can not be readily found. One additional emergency field should be located on the east side of the Cascade divide at perhaps Cle Elum or some suitable point just east of the Divide.

Weather

Weather conditions over the entire route are exceptionally favorable for flying. The modern airplane is capable of negotiating all but the most violent storms. With the proper facilities for the dissemination of weather information flying over the northern airway should be possible the entire year.

A study of winter weather conditions at the various cities along the line was made extending over a period of five years. A similar study was made of weather conditions at the cities along the central transcontinental route, from San Francisco to Chicago. A comparison of the two routes shows that although there are lower temperatures encountered during the winter over the northern route, there are more clear days and less precipitation in cities along the northern airway.

It is difficult to make a very accurate report on weather conditions along the entire airway due to the lack of complete statistical data and because the weather is based on so many variable elements. Nevertheless, a careful study and analysis of existing records and weather data reveals that the northern airway is practical for yearly operation, as far as weather is concerned. This is substantiated by the fact that air mail lines operate on daily schedule throughout the year from both ends and the middle of the northern airway. The National Parks Airways (Inc.) have operated an air transport line from Great Falls, Mont., to Salt Lake City via Helena and Butte, in the heart of the Rocky Mountains, during the entire year for three years with a remarkable record of completed scheduled trips.

The snowfall is very light over this route. The maximum recorded during any one month over a period of five years at cities along the airway was only 25 inches. The average maximum during any one month is only 8 inches.

Operators on all airports along the line have been consulted and unanimously contend that landings and take-offs can be made at their fields during the entire winter, with the provision in several instances that runways be kept clear of snowdrifts.

At the present time there are Government weather stations at St. Paul, Ellendale, a town located approximately 30 miles north of Aberdeen, Miles City, Billings, Missoula, Spokane, and Seattle. These stations are strategically located at approximately 300-mile intervals and would serve as division points in the dissemination of weather information by radio as soon as the airway is developed and facilities are available for collecting information at intermediate points and radio stations are installed. Telegraph and telephone lines parallel the entire route, making the ground communication problem a simple one.

President development of the northern airway

The northern airway, in regards to airports and emergency fields, can be considered to be in a very high state of development. All of the principal cities along the route have adequate airports, and there are emergency fields already developed and spaced at approximately 30-mile intervals along the line. Only a few intermediate emergency fields would have to be prepared by the Government in order to bring this airway up to the standard required by the Government for civil airways. The requirement is emergency fields every 30 miles.

It is important that the most mountainous flying country between Spokane and Butte is well equipped with flying fields spaced at approximately 30-mile intervals. There is a splendid field at Spokane, equipped with boundary lights, flood lights, and beacon; a good intermediate field at Coeur d'Alene, approximately 25 miles distant from Spokane; another good intermediate field at Kellogg, Idaho, 35 miles farther. There is an emergency field located at Wallace, Idaho, just on the west side of the St. Regis Pass; a good field at Superior, Mont., approximately 50 miles from Wallace, and a splendid field at Missoula, Mont., 40 miles farther.

Missoula is a regular stop on the present Seattle-St. Paul air-transport line.

There is one field located between Missoula and Butte, a little more than halfway distant, at Deer Lodge, but a second field could easily be prepared between Deer Lodge and Missoula, Mont., which would complete this leg of the route, with landing fields spaced at the proper intervals. Butte has a well-developed airport and is a regular stop on the line.

Approximately 60 miles east of Butte, over the Continental Divide, there is a good intermediate field at Three Forks, Mont. Ten miles farther, at Belgrade, there is a field, and another one at Livingston, Big Timber, Laurel, and Billings all have airports spaced at intervals of 30, 46, and 17 miles, respectively.

Billings is located approximately 190 miles air line from Butte and, due to its strategic railroad location, is a regular stop on the present air line. The next airport, at Forsythe, is 96 miles from Billings and 40 miles from Miles City. Miles City is about halfway between Spokane and St. Paul, a strategic location for operations and traffic control. Miles City appreciates its position and is at present building a large steel and concrete hangar with shop and waiting room sufficient to accommodate all air-transport operations conducted at their airport.

About 75 miles east of Miles City there is a fine airport at Baker, Mont. The country between Miles City and Baker affords numerous locations for another intermediate field between these two cities. There are already four established intermediate fields between Baker and Aberdeen, S. Dak., the next regular stop and division point on the line, and the country is generally so flat and clear that additional fields could be placed at regular 30-mile intervals without any difficulty whatsoever. The intermediate fields at Sagmiller, Hettinger, Lemmon, and Mobridge are all in excellent condition.

The airway from Miles City to Aberdeen follows generally the Milwaukee Railroad, and all of the above-mentioned airports are at cities along this railway. The airway distance between Miles City and Aberdeen is approximately 375 miles. Aberdeen has just developed a splendid airport which is in every respect a worthy contribution to the northern airway. A modern hangar capable of accommodating large trimotored planes is now under construction at the Aberdeen field.

Although there are not many developed airports between Aberdeen and St. Paul, the country is such that landings can be made in available fields along practically the entire distance. At the present time there are landing fields developed at Montevideo and Willmar, on a direct line between Aberdeen and St. Paul. Willmar is approximately halfway between these two division points, and the airway distance between Aberdeen and St. Paul is approximately 275 miles.

Six additional emergency fields between St. Paul and Aberdeen would enable this division of the airway to meet the requirements of the Department of Commerce for intermediate fields spaced every 30 miles. The additional fields could be located at Montrose, Litchfield, and Appleton, Minn., all of which are on the Great Northern Railroad leading directly into St. Paul. The other fields should be located at Millbank and Webster, S. Dak.

On the western end of the airway, between Spokane and Seattle, there are already intermediate fields at Harrington, Cheney, Waterville, Wenatchee, Ellensburg, and North Bend. The nature of the country between Spokane and Wenatchee makes it possible to land practically anywhere, and the matter of establishing emergency fields is merely one of marking existing fields that are already suitable for landing.

Between Wenatchee and Seattle there is one field at Ellensburg and another at North Bend on the west side of the Cascade Range. One additional field should be located on the east side of the Cascade Divide at, perhaps, Cle Elum, or some suitable point just east of the divide.

In summarizing, we find that the airway is already in a high state of development in regards to terminals and intermediate fields. The Department of Commerce requirement of landing fields every 30 miles over an airway is almost met at the present time between Spokane and Miles City, Mont., the most hazardous part of the route. Both ends of the airway, although requiring additional intermediate emergency fields, extend over ideal flying country covered with natural landing fields.

There are Government weather stations at division points along the line and also direct telegraph service, both of which greatly facilitate the problem and cost of collecting and disseminating weather information over the route.

There are beacon lights at Seattle, Spokane, Minneapolis, and St. Paul. Other division points have expressed their willingness to erect beacons as soon as the airway is recognized by the Government. The installation of beacon lights every 10 miles will be simple and inexpensive, since the route parallels railroads and power lines the entire distance.

Scheduled operations

During the past summer a private company has operated an air-transport service between Seattle and St. Paul. This service was operated in two divisions—one from Spokane to Seattle, the other from Spokane to St. Paul. The line from Spokane to Seattle was inaugurated May 3, 1930, on a daily round-trip schedule, the plane leaving Spokane in the morning and arriving from Seattle the same night. The other division, from Spokane to St. Paul, was inaugurated the 9th of June, 1930, operating on a triweekly schedule between the two terminals and making scheduled stops at Missoula, Butte, Billings, Miles City, Aberdeen, and Minneapolis.

The airway distance from Spokane to Seattle is approximately 250 miles and from Spokane to the Twin Cities 1,250, making a total airway distance of 1,500 miles.

It was found from a 5-month traffic analysis that the transport line from Spokane to St. Paul catered to transcontinental business from the Pacific coast going east and from Chicago and points east of Chicago traveling west. For example, passengers traveling from Seattle to Chicago would take the train at Seattle at night, arriving in Spokane the next morning in time to catch the plane for St. Paul. The plane arrives at St. Paul that same evening in time to catch one of a number of night trains for Chicago, which arrive early the next morning. This combined plane and train service provided a 1-day and 2-night schedule between Chicago and the Pacific coast.

It was also found that many eastbound travelers from Seattle preferred to take the plane out of Seattle in the evening and spend the night in Spokane prior to their departure the next morning by plane for St. Paul.

Ford trimotored 12-passenger planes, powered with Wright J6* motors, are used on the line between Spokane and Seattle. High-speed Buhl 5-place planes, powered with Pratt & Whitney Wasp motors, are used on the service between Spokane and St. Paul. Both schedules were operated without interruption during the summer and fall.

The operating efficiency of the Spokane-Seattle line during the months of May, June, July, August, and September was 96 per cent. The number of flights completed on scheduled time on the St. Paul division was 90 per cent. These are very high percentages for operations over an undeveloped airway.

In studying the traffic statistics over the period of entire operation it was learned that most of the travel between Spokane and St. Paul was through traffic, passengers traveling from points east of St. Paul and Chicago to points west of Spokane. The fact that over 1,000 passengers a day travel between St. Paul and Spokane, over the three transcontinental railroads, shows that there is an enormous potential volume of air traffic traveling over this route.

The transcontinental line from Seattle to St. Paul was operated in two divisions. This allowed a round trip, daily schedule to be flown between Spokane and Seattle, where there is a very large volume of local traffic, and a triweekly schedule between Spokane and St. Paul. Traffic over both lines showed a steady increase during the summer. At the end of the summer both lines were operating at capacity loads, showing that this service was receiving recognition and support. Operations proved that an 11-hour schedule could be maintained consistently between Spokane and St. Paul, being affected by shortness of daylight rather than adverse weather.

The present passenger traffic, viewed in the light of the potential volume of traffic over this line, would justify immediate development of the airway.

Transportation always has been and always will be indispensable to industry and commerce. The latter has progressed in direct proportion to the developments and improvements in the former.

The Northern States must protect their industries and commerce, and will demand development of an airway serving their country. There is a real economic need of a northern airway.

Air mail

The Watres bill, passed in 1930, was drafted primarily to aid air-transport lines and provide a steady income while they were building up passenger and express business to the point where they would be self-supporting.

Private capital has pioneered the development of the Northern Airway, and has been instrumental in improving this route to its present state of development. It is impossible for a private enterprise to develop an airway of like distance without some aid from the Government. There is an economic need of an air-transport service over the northern route, there is a military need for its development, and great possibilities for fast air mail service schedules to be developed over this line.

In order to continue their pioneering and develop an adequate air-transport service over this line private companies need the minimum assistance afforded by the Watres bill. Air mail could be carried by planes operating on the present schedule between Spokane and St. Paul without any improvements on the airway; however, the daily through schedule could not be maintained during the winter months without lighting both ends of the route. If a mail contract were awarded in the spring of 1931 mail could be carried during daylight between Spokane and St. Paul all summer. During the summer both ends of the airway could be lighted at a minimum cost to the Government, since the route follows both power lines and railways, which would offer accessible power and provide suitable locations for beacon lights along the line. With both ends lighted, a daily 11-hour service between Spokane and St. Paul could be operated during the entire year. This schedule would allow air mail to be posted in Seattle in the evening, arrive in Spokane by train early the next morning, and be in St. Paul that same night ready for morning delivery.

Spokane, Missoula, Butte, Billings, Miles City, Aberdeen, and the Twin Cities, as well as all cities immediately adjacent to and within night rail service of the line, would profit by this service.

The ultimate service rendered over this route is a night air mail schedule over lighted airway between Seattle and St. Paul. Letters posted in Seattle at 5 p. m. would arrive in St. Paul in time for early morning delivery. Chicago mail would be flown on to that city and delivered before noon. The westbound schedule would be the same, and St. Paul mail posted at 5 p. m. would arrive in Seattle the next morning. The Post Office Department is

farsighted in its program of establishing air mail lines and can not fail to see and appreciate these advantages.

When it is considered that the northern airway is the natural and by far the shortest air mail route between eastern points and the Northwestern States, Alaska, and the Orient, the potential volume of air mail over this route is apparent.

The northern airway is destined to be one of the most important airways in the country, and the Government will be highly repaid for any aid in its development.

The future air mail possibilities of the route justifies consideration at this time, and the economic needs of the country served demand that this airway be developed immediately to the State where regular daily air-transport service can be operated during the entire year.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to supplement what was said on this matter by the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] with some facts which seem to me of particular pertinence. The Senator has called attention to the present three transcontinental lines indicated upon the map. Each of those follows the line of a well-known railroad route to the Pacific coast. The more southerly one follows the general route of the Southern Pacific Railway. The middle one follows the route of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad. The more northerly route follows the route of the Union Pacific Railroad. That is quite proper, because, of course, the railroad lines picked out in the first place those sections of the country that would be likely, by reason of their natural resources and that kind of thing, and the flow of settlement, to afford traffic to the various lines. As a matter of course, having entered those regions they have built up those sections of the country. It is quite proper when the air lines shall be established that they would in a general way follow those lines.

But let me call attention to the situation in the northern part of the western country. That part of the country, including the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, is traversed by three transcontinental railroad lines—the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific—indicating a denser population and a denser volume of business and a greater flow of mail passing through that part of the country than to any of the more southerly regions.

Not only that, Mr. President, but that route long since was selected by the Post Office Department itself as the most speedy route along which communication could be had with the entire Orient, and accordingly, away back in 1909, a contract was entered into with the Great Northern Railway to put upon its line an exclusive mail train. That train has for the last 20 years carried the mail going to the northwest portion of the country and to the Orient. It carries nothing else except express; it does not even carry any passengers. Every other train on the line, passenger as well as freight, gets out of the way of this special mail train. Accordingly, Mr. President, it is possible to transport mail, according to the figures given me by the Post Office Department, from Shanghai to Seattle in 15 days, while it takes 19 days to go by way of San Francisco and, of course, 19 days to go by way of any other of the ports on the coast which now have mail connection with the East. It takes but 11 days for mail to go from Yokohama to Seattle, while it takes 15 days for it to go from Yokohama to San Francisco. It takes only 13 days for mail to go from Seattle to Yokohama and 17 days for it to go to Shanghai, but from San Francisco to Yokohama it takes 17 days, and to Shanghai it takes 21 days. So this is the situation, that for 20 years the Post Office Department itself has recognized that the shortest route to the Orient is over one of these northern routes that pass from St. Paul to Seattle.

Moreover, as I have indicated, that route is traversed by three lines of railroad, and yet it is lacking any air mail line, while the section to the south is covered by three air mail lines.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. At the annual meeting of the National Aeronautic Association at Chicago last fall this whole matter was presented and very carefully considered by delegates

from all over the United States. A resolution was unanimously adopted urging upon the Government the opening of the line to which the Senator is referring as one that was urgently needed and perfectly practicable, although at the present time the Post Office Department holds, as the Senator doubtless knows, that on account of the severity of the weather in the wintertime it does not believe it to be quite practicable; but pilots and the Aeronautical Association have gone on record as believing it not only to be practicable but that it should be opened.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It seems to me that there is a perfectly sufficient answer to that contention, because for the last two years a line has been operated from Salt Lake City to Great Falls, Mont. That line passes through Ogden, Pocatello, and the city of Butte, the termini being Salt Lake and Great Falls. Bear in mind that that route is in the mountains all the way; really it is a route which traverses the very summit of the Rocky Mountains all the way, a distance, my recollection is, of about five hundred and odd miles, while the route proposed, directly following the route of either the Northern Pacific or the Great Northern or the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, flying by any of those routes, would be in the mountains probably not more than for 200 miles, considerable less at least than the line that is being operated daily and in connection with which no trouble whatever is being encountered on account of the weather. So that suggestion can not possibly be maintained; indeed, Mr. President, I have been unable to find any reason whatever for thus discriminating against that section of the country.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. On the statement of facts set forth by the Senator from Montana the subcommittee of the Post Office Committee and the whole Post Office Committee and I think the Appropriations Committee were very generally agreed. As I stated earlier in the course of the discussion, no one could look at the map, with that wide expanse in which there is no air service, without feeling that there must be some good reason why the apparent discrimination existed.

I can say to the Senator from Montana that we sought diligently to find out why it was that the Post Office Department had not recommended the route. The Senator from Montana has explained in part the reasons which actuated the department in pointing out the other route which could to some extent serve the transcontinental mail; but I must call the Senator's attention to another fact. It was developed that in order to initiate this route there would be required an expenditure of, I think, \$1,600,000 on the part of the Government alone in providing equipment, such as beacons and other necessary aids along the airway.

Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Montana that so far as the Committee on Appropriations, or the subcommittee, at any rate, dealing with this measure is concerned, every member believes that the route should be established. We encountered, of course, the difficulties which necessarily an appropriations committee has to meet when the executive department having jurisdiction of the subject matter refuses its assent. Facing that condition, and confronting also the difficulties which we had with the conferees on the part of the other branch of Congress, we sought to do something that would more completely link this project up with the program of the Post Office Department. We think we have accomplished that by reason of an item in the bill carrying appropriations for the Department of Commerce to provide for a complete and comprehensive survey of the route, and making an appropriation therefor.

Having been actively identified with the project in the Post Office Committee and as a member ex officio of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I know perfectly well that air mail development in this country can not succeed unless it has some degree of symmetry and unless it progresses along the lines of the Senator's argu-

ment, namely, with the idea of saving time in the transportation of the mail. It will be many years, I suppose, before the air transportation of mails can reach anything like a self-supporting basis. In the meantime we have to develop air routes experimentally and also with reference to geographic distribution through the country.

I share fully the opinion which the Senator has expressed with reference to that great expanse of country in which no air mail service is now rendered. I have a deeper feeling about that, Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Montana, because if he will turn to the northeast corner of the map showing the section of the country from which I chance to come he will find exactly the same situation; a comparatively large extent of territory over which there is no air mail service whatever, and with all the feeling of irksomeness in the face of a situation such as that we all rebel against it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But let me remind the Senator that, while I sympathize with him in the situation in which he is placed, that the distances in his section of the country are trifling compared with the distances in the section of the country from which I came, and, of course, mail service is reasonably prompt in the northeastern portion of the United States.

Mr. MOSES. I freely admit that, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not mean to say that we are entitled to any preference over the Northeast at all, but I call attention to the great distances in the northwestern section of the country.

Mr. MOSES. May I say, by way of reply—by way of exculpation, possibly I ought to say, instead of reply—that probably the volume of mails delivered between point to point in the New England territory is larger than the mail that would be delivered point to point between St. Paul and Seattle.

However, Mr. President, that does not excuse the situation which exists. I agree with the Senator that the route should be established. I think we have taken steps to insure its establishment. I voted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington; I did my best in conference to assure its acceptance by the other House; but with the difficulties that encountered the progress we were attempting to make by reason of the attitude of the department, we had to seek some other method of getting at it, and it is my opinion that the step we have taken in the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce makes absolutely certain the establishment of that route.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire—and I thank him for his sentiments thus expressed with respect to this matter—that neither I nor any, I think, of those who are interested in this particular amendment to the appropriation bill doubt for a moment that the conferees on the part of the Senate have done everything they could to retain the amendment in the bill, and that they recognize the justice of this consideration being accorded to the northwestern section of the country. However, the Senator from New Hampshire will bear in mind that this is the only opportunity we have of vigorously addressing the House of Representatives upon this particular subject.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes; I understand that and I may say—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And we want to do what we can to support the hands of our conferees upon this particular subject.

Now let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire what possible ground could the conferees of the House take or did the conferees take against this proposal?

Mr. MOSES. I have to be very prudent in what I say with reference to what took place in the conference, because the Senate was admonished by the Senator from Washington the other day with reference to that matter; but I do feel perfectly at liberty to say that the conferees on the part of the House based their objection upon the two grounds which I have mentioned, namely, that the Post Office Department had not recommended it, and, furthermore, that they had had

from some source—and I have spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, who was also chairman of the conference committee, to ascertain if he could produce the document—that they had had a report, I think, from the Department of Commerce showing that it would cost, I think it was between \$1,500,000 and \$1,600,000 to do the things necessary to establish the route. Because of those considerations the House conferees rested their case upon what they thought was an absolutely impregnable foundation.

I did not agree with that. The Senator from Tennessee not being on the floor, I can not summon him to bear testimony, but he and I began some years ago in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, while appropriation bills were still handled in that committee, to develop the appropriations for air mail service, and we have seen those appropriations rise from \$3,000,000 a year to \$20,000,000 a year in the pending bill; but it has been our feeling constantly that all sections of the country should have exactly similar treatment with reference to air mail service. The only suggestion I have ever advanced that would militate against that general theory was as to the extension of routes into the northeastern section of the country because of the greater density of population and presumably the greater volume of the first-class mail; but the Senator from Montana has produced an unanswerable argument when he indicates, as he just has, the number of days to be saved in the transportation of the oriental mail alone; and when we think, Mr. President, of the attempts we are making to develop our trade in the Orient it seems to me a very short-sighted policy not to establish immediately a quicker means of communication with that populous and profitable section for our commerce. On the contrary, we have encountered all through the present session of Congress the state of facts I have indicated. We have had three conferences, may I remind the Senator from Montana, on this bill, and that state of facts has constantly confronted us as we went into conference. It seems to me that the conferees have done the best they could, and, in the language of the poet, "Angels could do no more."

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MOSES. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I want to confirm what my colleague on the committee has stated with reference to the estimate which I believe was made by the Department of Commerce. I sent for the papers, but regret they have not been received. The estimate was that between a million five hundred thousand and a million six hundred thousand dollars would be necessary for this purpose. The statement made by the Post Office Department's representatives and the representative of the Commerce Department with whom I talked was that the mail line would have to be illumined. There is where the great expense would come in—in lighting it. Otherwise, we would merely have day flying, which time to Seattle for eastern mail would be equaled by the present route, which goes to Chicago and from Chicago to Cheyenne and Salt Lake City.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me see, then, if I understand the Senator from Colorado; namely, that before we can get an authorization of this mail route something like a million and a half dollars must be expended in preparation.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no!

Mr. WALSH of Montana. When does the Senator from Colorado think we will be able to get an appropriation of a million and a half dollars to take care of this expenditure?

Mr. PHIPPS. A survey, which will cost about twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars—which will be provided for, as I understand, this session—will indicate just how much it will cost to illumine the proposed route and to determine the best route.

It would not be necessary to wait until the fields are illumined before day flying could be carried out. Flying by

day would be all right. That could be done right along, making stops overnight. To get the expeditious handling of mail which we now get by the Cheyenne-Salt Lake City route to Seattle, however, the line would have to be lighted, of course.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I think the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads requires some amplification.

I tried to point out in the conference that the attempt to charge \$750,000 as carried in this bill and \$1,500,000 as the estimated cost of the route altogether to this appropriation was not warranted, because the Department of Commerce have large funds for the development of aviation. We are increasing those funds at every Congress; and it is their business to do the thing which they estimate is to cost a million and a half, and which the other branch of Congress are using as an argument against the immediate establishment of this route. In other words, they confound the two executive departments. They confound two entirely distinct types of executive function.

What the Senator from Montana is seeking, what I want to bring about, what I tried to bring about, is the transportation of the mails. As for the furnishing of such facilities as are necessary under existing statutes, that being in the function of another department, I think it is wholly erroneous and altogether unjust that they should attempt to charge all of that cost against this one route.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I might say with respect to those matters that if we go to the Department of Commerce for any assistance whatever in connection with this route, they simply refer us to the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, well, "pass the buck" is a common motto in Washington.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think the Senator is mistaken in that. It is the function of the Department of Commerce to furnish lighting, and facilities of that kind, along these various routes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But they will not do it unless there is an immediate prospect of a mail route, as a matter of course.

Mr. JONES. No; I do not think that is exactly their position, because the appropriation for the Department of Commerce just a very few years ago for these air facilities, and so forth, was about \$3,000,000 a year. For the coming fiscal year it is nearly \$9,000,000; and it would add probably another million dollars to that for them to take up this route, which I hope they will do next year.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But obviously the Department of Commerce, in making expenditures from that fund, will expend it primarily along the routes where the mail is carried.

Mr. JONES. Oh, that is probably true also.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And, of course, when we go to the Department of Commerce with respect to this matter they will say that there is not any mail on this route; that we have to take care of a mail proposition.

Mr. JONES. But they recognize the situation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was going to say, with respect to this necessity of expending a million and a half, that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] has called attention to the fact that practically every town of importance along this line already has its airport, its air field, so that there is no difficulty about landing. In addition to that the route has been traversed now for over a year by the Mamer Co., which has a triweekly service over this route; and it seems to have no difficulty about the matter of lighting, or about airports, or anything of that kind.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If passengers may be carried with perfect safety over this route—and I have not heard of an accident on the route during all the time they have been operating—why should not the mail be carried over it?

Mr. MOSES. The Senator is entirely correct about that. The Senator may recall that I made a visit into that section by airplane last fall—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have heard about it.

Mr. MOSES. On an errand which I deemed of some consequence, and which I performed in perfect safety up to now. It is true that substantially every community noted upon that route has its landing field. The facilities for lighting, the beacons, and the general signboards, if one may so term them, are lacking.

I have always thought that the estimate of cost for establishing this route was greatly exaggerated. I had thought we could go on and do it this year perfectly easily; but not being able to do it, we had to take the next best thing, which was to provide in the Commerce bill for the survey, when we will know exactly what that will do.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. As an illustration of how little reliance can be placed upon what the Department of Commerce say about the cost of these matters, I remind the Senate that they first said that it would cost \$50,000 to make the survey. Now they are down to \$20,000; and I call attention to another fact:

They take the position that this route should not be established because we have not a lighted airway; we have not all these various facilities ready for an air mail route. I venture to say that not half a dozen air mail routes in this country had those things when they were established. They came as a result of the fact that the air mail routes were established.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Anyway, Mr. President, the situation is left in this way—that that section of the country is obviously and grossly discriminated against; and no real, substantial reason why this appropriation should not be made seems to have been offered by anybody.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply wish to emphasize the able statements made by my colleague [Mr. DILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. They have clearly pointed out the facts and the situation.

I want to see this mail route established just as soon as possible; but I think I appreciate the situation. While it is true that the Department of Commerce submitted an estimate of the cost, amounting to something like \$1,600,000 or \$1,700,000, I think they indicated that that was simply an estimate, a sort of a guess in a way. While it is true that they estimated the cost of a survey in the first instance at \$50,000, and that they have now reduced that to \$20,000, I took up this matter with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Young; and his first advice was that they ought to have probably \$50,000 to make this survey. Then, later, he frankly advised me that \$20,000 would make it; and I have seen to it that \$20,000 has been added in the Commerce appropriation bill. I have not any doubt but that that \$20,000 will be agreed to in conference, at any rate.

While I should like to see this project undertaken now, knowing the situation as I do, I feel that under all the circumstances we ought not to reject this conference report on that account; that it would not help us any; but that the best thing for us to do is to adopt the conference report and get the \$20,000 for a survey. With this discussion and the opinions that have been expressed here on the floor, I feel that we can insist upon the Department of Commerce including in their estimates for aviation for the next year a sufficient amount to lead to the establishment of this route; and I believe that is the quickest and best way to get what we all desire. If I thought otherwise, I should vote against the conference report; but I do not think so.

I want to say further that I do not regret this argument. I think it is well to have these splendid statements in the Record, in order to let the department know what the attitude is here in the Senate. That is going to help us in getting proper estimates so that this line can be taken up in the very near future.

In view of the situation as it now is, I feel very confident that in the next appropriation bill we shall have this route provided for.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters and telegrams from various organizations and individuals favoring this project to establish a northern air mail route. In view of the fact that this item has been eliminated from the bill, I shall vote against the conference report.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., January 30, 1931.

Mr. B. K. WHEELER,

United States Senator from Montana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHEELER: I am inclosing you a copy of a letter I have recently written to Mr. E. B. Wadsworth, superintendent of the Air Mail Service in the Post Office Department. You will notice what we are trying to do when you read the letter, and that is to get air mail service in our wide, open country out here, which we believe was the spirit of the Watres bill.

They seem to argue that our population is not great enough, while we are convinced that the amount of business going out of this Northwest and the correspondence necessitated by being so far from the centers of business and exchange that we need the air transport more than the greater centers of population. In other words, our need for air service is far more important in proportion to our population than the Eastern and Middle Western States.

Will you help to do something about this, if you can?

Sincerely,

EARL T. VANCE.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., January 27, 1931.

E. B. WADSWORTH,

Superintendent Division of Air Mail Service,
United States Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In further reference to our correspondence regarding air mail lines for the Northwest, I respectfully request your attention to our ideas on this as I will outline below. When the Federal legislation known as the Watres bill became law we believed it was intended to help commercial aviation. In its heading we find the passage "further to encourage commercial aviation by authorizing the Postmaster General to establish air mail routes." Webster says "encourage" means "to help forward" as well as "to inspire with courage or hope."

Discussion of this Watres bill in House Report No. 1209 and Senate Report No. 524 carries this language: "It is believed that bona fide operating companies which have been the pioneers in air transportation and have gained valuable experience at great financial loss and even sacrifice of many lives are entitled to this consideration in bidding." Both these reports also refer to encouragement of commercial aviation. In this connection I wish to direct your attention to the fact that I have continually flown since the war as my sole occupation, and for four years we have had a corporation with considerable investment trying to build a commercial business that would pay. The Watres bill led us to believe we could expect some help in establishing air passenger lines. We have never injured a passenger.

Your letter of January 22, 1931, to me says, "Based upon the small amount of air mail handled into and out of Montana at the present time, it is the impression of this office that an air mail route from Great Falls to Billings and Casper would not be warranted by the amount of traffic available." But, Mr. Wadsworth, the 40 cents per mile provision of the Watres bill says, "Whenever sufficient air mail is not available, first-class mail matter may be added to make up the maximum load specified in such contract." So, evidently, it was intended that service should be given where strictly "air mail" letters would not be of sufficient volume to make up the load, in order "to further encourage commercial aviation." Our planned route from here to Casper through Billings would eventually, with your sanction, connect with Boeing line at Cheyenne and save at least 300 miles getting Montana mail to the transcontinental, it being the hypotenuse of the right-angled triangle formed by National Parks Airways and Boeing Line from Salt Lake City to Cheyenne. As the Post Office now pays by the mile, this would be a considerable saving in money. Our idea, however, is to give great transcontinental mail lines and thus serve the towns along all these lines through connections to pick up mail and passengers, and this in a territory where north and south train service is slow and uncomfortable.

Your letter also states "there is not the population to draw from that seems to be necessary in the operation of aircraft to make the route a success." Must I understand that the Post Office Department thinks these sparsely settled regions must wait for air transportation until their populations have become much greater? Why, sir, that would put the Northwest air transportation out of the question for the next century. Rather, is it not true that airplane service is needed more in these sparsely settled regions where towns are relatively smaller and distances between

are greater than between the large cities, where already good, fast train service and good roads are in existence? I think the facts and history already prove this is true. In the far reaches of northern Canada and Alaska, where there is very little population, air transport has proven itself. Our own Post Office Department has always been proud of the fact that it serves the rural communities with mail and star routes oftentimes serving only isolated families or small communities. Why should we not have this same ideal of service for air mail?

Mr. Wadsworth, if you and Mr. Glover should come out here and see how people dislike traveling on our slow, uncomfortable north and south trains—yes, and ride them yourselves—and see how they look with favor and enthusiasm upon any proposition to bring them air lines, as well as how they readily patronize these lines when established, perhaps you would help us get these routes started.

We have spent much money and learned this country and how to operate airplanes in it, and do not see how any line can prosper without the assistance which evidently was intended to be given such projects by the Watres bill with its 40 cents per mile provision.

We believe in the future of air transport, and believe the people of the Northwest are entitled to some of this service. They are taxpayers and United States citizens, rearing their families, operating their businesses, and thereby helping to build up a vast part of our country. In fact, as I see it, they have greater need for air transport service than the more densely populated areas.

This air-transport idea has become my life work as well as that of those associated with me in this enterprise, and we firmly believe it is the duty of the Post Office Department to seriously investigate our claims and, if possible, to give assistance in at least advertising for bids on these Northwest lines.

Very respectfully,

EARL T. VANCE,
Manager Border Air Lines.

BUTTE, MONT., December 12, 1930.

Hon. B. K. WHEELER,

Senator, State of Montana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you a copy of a petition which has been prepared, showing all the details with regard to the proposed northern transcontinental air mail route.

This is supplementing a recent telegram to you, and I hope that you may be able to devote some attention to supporting this measure. We certainly want to have Butte on the east-west route when put into motion.

I shall appreciate any help that you can render in this matter. With kindest personal regards, in which Mrs. Meyer joins, I am,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MEYER.

BOZEMAN, MONT., December 12, 1930.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,

United States Senate:

We believe northern air mail route feasible, practicable, and necessary for development and growth of this section. Would respectfully urge your support of amendment reinstating \$750,000 in air mail budget for establishment of this route.

BOZEMAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MILES CITY, MONT., December 19, 1930.

Hon. B. K. WHEELER,

Senator from Montana:

We are the only section of the United States not served with air mail, and the House conferees rejected appropriation this morning. The citizens of eastern Montana will appreciate your influence and assistance in obtaining favorable action on this appropriation.

E. B. WINTER.
J. E. GRAVES.
THOMAS BUSEY.
WILLIAM H. BARTLEY.
D. L. O'HERN.

Resolution 597

Be it resolved, That the City Council of the City of Miles City, Mont., indorses the effort to secure the passage of the \$750,000 appropriation required to establish the northern air mail route between Seattle and the Twin Cities via Spokane, Wash., Missoula, Butte, Billings, and Miles City, Mont., and Aberdeen, S. Dak. The cities herein mentioned have spent large sums of money in developing and equipping airports, being largely influenced in this by the possibility of the early establishment of transcontinental air service along this route, the aggregate of such expenditures by all the cities and towns along the proposed route being, we are informed, \$10,000,000. We believe the northern route is justified by the revenues and service in prospect, and we commend the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana for their efforts to secure the passage of the necessary appropriation. The Senate having passed the appropriation, we sincerely hope the House leaders will not oppose its adoption by that body. And we direct that the city clerk send

copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from this State as well as to the chairmen of the appropriate committees in the Senate and House at Washington.

Adopted this 5th day of January, 1931.

FRED W. WOOLSEY, Mayor.

Attest:
[SEAL.]

RAY ADDINGTON, City Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], who is necessarily absent from the city. I agreed to pair with him on this vote, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], and vote "nay."

I was requested to say that if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GILLET. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLENN. I have a general pair for to-day with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIAMSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia, and not knowing how he would vote I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HATFIELD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WILLIAMSON] is unavoidably detained. I do not know how he would vote if he were present, but I think he would vote "nay."

Mr. BLEASE. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK] and vote "nay."

Mr. BROCK. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PARTRIDGE], and in his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. PHIPPS (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—22

Carey	Hastings	Moses	Stelwer
Dale	Hatfield	Oddie	Townsend
Deneen	Hebert	Patterson	Vandenberg
Goff	Kean	Reed	Watson
Goldsbrough	McNary	Shortridge	
Hale	Morrow	Smoot	

NAYS—47

Ashurst	Couzens	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barkley	Cutting	La Follette	Shipstead
Black	Dill	McGill	Smith
Blaine	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Bleas	Frazier	McMaster	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Hawes	Nye	Trammell
Brookhart	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Bulkley	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Johnson	Ransdell	Wheeler
Copeland	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	

NOT VOTING—27

Bingham	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Brock	Glenn	Morrison	Stephens
Broussard	Gould	Norbeck	Tydings
Capper	Harris	Partridge	Walcott
Davis	Harrison	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Fess	Keyes	Schall	Williamson
Gillett	King	Simmons	

So the report was rejected.

Mr. ODDIE subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago I was attending an important meeting of the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate, and at that time a discussion was going on in the Senate regarding the conference report on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. I came to the Senate Chamber when the bell rang, and voted. I was under a misapprehension as to what was being voted on, and I voted "yea." If I had known what really was involved, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I feel that the Senate has voted under a misapprehension. The adoption of the second conference report merely involves two questions—that the Senate recede from the appropriation for the northwestern air mail route, and recede on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] controlling the leasing of garages under conditions. It did not involve the salary question at all. I tried to make it plain and clear this morning that we would dispose of the other matters first, and then that I would make a separate motion with reference to the salaries. This is going to delay not only the consideration of this bill but of every appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why does the Senator assume that the Senate did not know what it was voting on, when the matter has been debated here for a couple of hours? The Senator went into detail as to the reasons which appealed to him for sustaining the motion he made, and the other side of the question was presented. It seems to me there is little justification for his statement.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is my impression, and if there were two or three Senators who would say they voted under a misapprehension I would move a reconsideration; otherwise I would not. I merely wanted to have it definitely understood that the vote taken did not affect the salary step-up question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is it the Senator's intention now to make a motion with respect to that latter subject?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is barred, because it goes back to conference. It is carried in this agreement. Even if we had adopted the second conference report it would still be in disagreement, as I tried to make clear this morning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in reply to what the Senator from Colorado has said, that I do not think there was any misapprehension.

Mr. PHIPPS. I am satisfied now that there was not, but I really thought there was, or I should not have changed my vote.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I desire to state on my own behalf that I was under a misapprehension when I stated how I would have voted. It is too late now to change the vote, but I thought we were voting on the general adoption of the conference report. I would merely like to state for the RECORD, in order that there may be no misapprehension as to my position, that I stated during the debate, while the Senator from Montana had the floor, that I am heartily in favor of the northern airways, and had I known that the vote was on that part of the conference report, and had I

been at liberty to vote, I should have voted as the majority did, instead of voting in the minority, as usual.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. So that instead of being under a misapprehension and voting against the motion of the Senator from Colorado, my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, would have voted for the motion under a misapprehension, as he just stated.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the independent offices appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; the pending amendment being on page 25, line 9, under the heading "Housing Corporation," to strike out "\$12,180" and insert "\$17,104."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think that amendment would better be passed over temporarily, because it really depends upon the next amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over temporarily, and the clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, line 9, under the heading "Housing Corporation," to strike out "\$19,930" and insert in lieu thereof "\$26,154."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we are now considering the appropriation to continue the Housing Corporation. That organization has been in existence for many years. The promise has been made each successive year for at least 10 years that the functions of this organization would cease and that it would be entirely liquidated. I ask the Senator from Washington how much longer the organization is to be continued? Is it immortal or is it to die some day?

Mr. JONES. We probably will have to study the proposition as to whether it is immortal or not. The Senator from Utah, I think, could give us a pretty good opinion with reference to that matter.

But let me say that I do not remember any promises being made from year to year that the Housing Corporation would be done away with. The appropriation has been, of course, decreased from year to year, and we make another decrease this year. It is hoped that its work will be concluded within the next year or two at least, so it can be turned over to some other agency of the Government without any additional expense. So far as I am concerned, I do not make the positive promise that that will be done. I feel that it can be done, and I hope that it may be done.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, the Senator will recall that our deceased friend the former Senator from Maine, Mr. Fernald, who was giving a great deal of attention to this matter, stated upon a number of occasions that the functions of the Housing Corporation would soon terminate. I recall quite distinctly the last time he was interrogated upon the subject—and that must have been at least five or six years ago—that the statement was made that its work was about wound up and it would soon be liquidated. My understanding was that it would be liquidated within a year, and I was wondering why it is being continued now.

Mr. JONES. Of course, if the Senator makes the statement that he heard those assurances, I do not question his statement at all. I have no recollection of hearing any such assurances myself. As I said, I do not question the Senator's statement that those assurances were given.

Mr. KING. The Senator understands that it was an organization created during the war, and it was understood that with the termination of the war and the coming of peace its activities would cease.

Mr. JONES. Oh, Mr. President, that could not have been understood by anybody who knew the situation at that time. Of course, it was hoped that its activities would cease as soon as possible, but the war ended and found the corporation with a great deal of property on its hands. That property had to be handled and dealt with. The Government sought to get its money out. They have been working,

and we have been continuing them from year to year in order to enable them to close up the business which was brought on during the war and which was not closed up nearly as soon as every one of us expected and hoped would be done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to give notice now that I shall cooperate with my colleague and with anyone else in the Senate to bring this organization to a close. I know that it had to run for years after the close of the war, but what my colleague has said in relation to it being a temporary organization is true. It was so stated at the time of its organization. I think that it is time now that we ought to give notice that we are going to see that the appropriation for the Housing Corporation shall cease. If they take that notice as being a fact, there will be some way found to administer the few pieces of property which may be left in the control of the organization. I ask my colleague, however, to let the provision go through this year. I think some notice will be taken of the statements which have been publicly made in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. KING. I thank my colleague for corroborating the position which I have taken with respect to the matter. But this bureau, like all other bureaus, when created seems never to want to die. If they can not find some work to do, they ask for a perpetuity of life and will engraft themselves upon some other activity, whether necessary or unnecessary, in order to prolong their existence.

Mr. JONES. That gives me a suggestion with reference to the idea contained in the House provision. Under the House provisions the Housing Corporation is going to be engrafted upon the Labor Department. I think it would be much wiser to leave it as it is, with the statement made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], with which I am in hearty accord so far as that is concerned, and that we give these people notice that they must close up their work by the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator support a resolution, limited, of course, to the Senate, that it is the sense of the Senate that the Housing Corporation shall complete its work within the next year?

Mr. JONES. I would concur in a proposal of that kind. I do not know that a resolution would add to the strength of the assurances we are giving here to-day. I want to say that I think the work of the Housing Corporation ought to be closed up within the next year, and unless something entirely unexpected or unforeseen comes up we shall expect it to be done.

Mr. KING. The assurance of one Senator, no matter how important he may be, as my colleague is in our work here, especially with reference to appropriations and finance, will not be regarded as a notice from the entire Senate. A resolution adopted by the Senate would convey notice, but a statement by my colleague or by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, who is in accord with my colleague and myself, that the organization must cease to function, would be treated as the statement of one Senator and would not have attached to it the importance that would attach to a Senate resolution if adopted.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. HOWELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I am interrupting the Senator to call attention to a suggestion made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the provision of the House will throw the work of the Housing Corporation into a department and thus engraft it on to something else. If the Senator will observe, the language of the House comes pretty near winding up the Housing Corporation. It puts it in a department, which must handle it without any increase of salary, whereas if we agree to the Senate committee amendment and strike

out the language of the House provision we will have continued the Housing Corporation with all its salaries.

Mr. JONES. The Housing Corporation is continued under the House provision which makes an official of the Department of Labor the president of the Housing Corporation.

Mr. NORRIS. But he gets no additional salary and will, in my opinion, soon wind up the affairs of the Housing Corporation.

Mr. JONES. The Senator knows that the chief clerk of the Department of Labor can not do his work as chief clerk of that department and the work of the Housing Corporation too, and so there will be provision made for additional employees in the Department of Labor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the fact that under the House text they must reduce the pay roll at the rate of \$13,770 a year, which would soon result in doing away with the salaries now being paid to those who are looking after this work.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to the facts in this case. The Housing Corporation holds for the Government about \$1,700,000 in mortgages and contracts of sale. The duties in connection with those mortgages and contracts are to collect the interest and to collect any increments that may be due under the contracts and under the mortgages. Some of this property is located outside of Washington and necessarily the Housing Corporation must depend upon collectors outside of Washington to do the work of collecting. In other words, that is an ordinary charge which they have to pay because they are now located here in Washington.

In addition to the \$1,700,000 of securities they have on hand only \$137,000 worth of real estate. That real estate consists almost entirely of vacant lots. If any of that property is sold it is sold through real-estate dealers in the cities wherever located, and the Housing Corporation, of course, must pay a commission. But here we are providing for the expenditure of \$26,154 and the employment of nine persons merely to collect the dues on these mortgages and contracts and to try to sell this \$137,000 worth of real estate. Such an expense is wholly unnecessary. The purpose of the House amendment was to transfer this work to another department. If one will read the hearings he will note that the chief clerk of the Department of Labor said that they knew nothing about the work, that it would be additional work, and that they do not have anyone who might undertake it who is familiar therewith.

But it happens that we have an official who is paid by the Government to look after property of just this kind and character and to collect dues and accounts and deal with them. That is the Alien Property Custodian. His duties are diminishing. The Alien Property Custodian could look after the collection of the interest on these mortgages and the increments that are to be paid annually, and could also look after the sale of the remaining real estate. As a matter of fact the Alien Property Custodian is former Senator Sutherland, a man familiar with real estate, an attorney who is familiar with this sort of work. It is my opinion that the work could be very properly transferred to the Alien Property Custodian. Therefore I suggest that in the place of the chief clerk or other officer of the Department of Labor, in that portion of the text which is stricken out on page 26, there be substituted therefor "Alien Property Custodian."

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. That reminds me of the fact that a year or two ago, when the bill providing for the settlement of all claims of American nationals against the German Government or of German nationals and the German Government against the United States was before the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, I offered an amendment restricting the activities of the claims commission to one year. Objection was made that it would require two years

to complete the work of the Alien Property Custodian. Accordingly, the motion which I made in the committee did not prevail, but it was understood that the work of that important organization, and I recognize its importance, would be concluded within a period of two years. There is no apparent evidence that it is reaching a period of dissolution and it is manifesting the same symptoms of immortality that characterize nearly every Federal bureau. It is arranging to live forever, and I am afraid if the Senator devolves upon the Alien Property Custodian's office these unimportant duties, which ought to be performed by some \$1,500-a-year clerk in the Treasury Department, it will be an additional reason for the perpetuity of its life.

So I do not approve of the suggestion, although I agree with the position the Senator takes that the Housing Corporation ought to cease, that it ought to wind up its affairs as it was promised years and years ago they would be wound up.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The statement made by my colleague in relation to the Alien Property Custodian's office is correct. I wish to say, however, that the reason the time was extended, as my colleague will recall, is that there were certain German claims which it was recommended the Alien Property Custodian should consider. It was finally decided by Congress that that should be done, and, that being done, it was necessary to extend the life of the organization every year.

I agree with my colleague that if we are going to transfer this work it should not be transferred to the Alien Property Custodian's office, because the work certainly must be pretty close to an end so far as that agency of the Government is concerned. I should prefer to let this item go this year, but if I am alive, and if I have influence enough, there will be no more appropriations for this work.

Mr. HOWELL. But is it not possible, I will ask the senior Senator from Utah, now to eliminate this \$26,154 and the employment of nine persons engaged in collecting interest upon the mortgages in hand looking after certain contracts and \$137,000 worth of vacant lots?

Mr. SMOOT. I agree that it is a perfectly useless expenditure of money, with the exception of one or two clerks. If we are going to take any action along this line, we ought to strike it entirely out of this bill. In the meantime the second deficiency appropriation bill will be here, and if we find that the work can not be successfully carried on by any agency now existing, the Treasury Department, say, then we can put an item in that bill appropriating so much as may be necessary for the purpose of having the work conducted by that department if it is decided that the affairs of the Housing Corporation should be wound up now.

Mr. HOWELL. Will not the Senator make a motion to that effect? Why defer it for a year?

Mr. SMOOT. If we are going to do anything at all, that is the way to do it; we should do it in this bill, and not transfer the work to the Alien Property Custodian's office.

Mr. HOWELL. Then, the Senator would propose to cut out the whole paragraph respecting the Housing Corporation?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and in the meantime we would find out what agency could perform the work of collecting the rent or interest, and perhaps find purchasers for the property. If it is thought best to repose that duty on the Treasury Department, we will ascertain the fact, and if it is thought better that the work should be performed by some other department, we will ascertain that, and then in the deficiency bill we can provide such sum as may be necessary.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, I move to strike out of the bill, on page 25, beginning with line 7, all the remainder of pages 25, 26, and the first three lines of page 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment would not be in order until individual amendments are reached. The

agreement under which the Senate is now operating is to dispose first of committee amendments. Individual amendments have not as yet been reached.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may now be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. I inquire what amendment is that?

Mr. HOWELL. To strike out the text regarding the Housing Corporation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think we ought to perfect the text before a motion to strike all of it out is acted upon. The Senator can make a motion to strike it all out, but first we should perfect the text as, in the opinion of the Senate, may seem best.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the committee recommends striking out a portion of the text. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to strike out all the language dealing with the Housing Corporation. It seems to me that, just as a matter of orderly procedure, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska should come first. If it shall carry, there will be no necessity for considering the committee amendment; and, if it shall not carry, then, the committee amendment, of course, will be considered. The question of striking out the House text or continuing the Housing Corporation under the direction of the chief clerk of the Labor Department would be in order. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska may be now considered.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. Is not the Senate operating under a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill shall be read in toto for a second reading and committee amendments shall be considered first?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the order, but the Senator from Wisconsin has asked unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska may be considered.

Mr. MOSES. In other words, to set aside one unanimous-consent agreement by another?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think if there is going to be a motion to strike out the whole text we ought first to have the text perfected, following the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator objects. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to ask if such an amendment as I am about to read would be in order?—

And provided further, That within the fiscal year 1932 all the properties now owned by the United States Housing Corporation shall be sold at public or private sale and the proceeds paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Would such an amendment be in order as a limitation upon the expenditure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator state the suggested amendment again?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it again.

And provided further, That within the fiscal year 1932 all the properties now owned by the United States Housing Corporation shall be sold at public or private sale and the proceeds paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would not be in order at this time, and it would not be in order if a point of order were made against it, because it is legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure about it; but, Mr. President, I merely want to say that so long as we dally with this matter we will have a large salary list every year just as we have now—some \$26,000. I think what we ought to do is to sell these securities, sell the lots, and cover the money into the Treasury. Such a course would not only be best for the Government but it would be best for the people of the United States. We are carrying this property and hiring a number of people to take care of it. What we ought to do is to sell the property.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JONES. The Senator appreciates the situation of the country to-day. Does he think that \$160,000 of securities and mortgages and things like that could be disposed of to advantage to the Government under present conditions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the proposed amendment nearly a year and a half would be given, and I certainly hope that the present conditions are not going to last for a year and a half. I believe it would be money in the Treasury to dispose of these properties as soon as possible.

Mr. JONES. I, too, think it would be, except that if we put the property up for sale right now under any terms, of course, we would get practically nothing out of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the proposed amendment a year and a half would be given, and that is a long while.

Mr. JONES. I did not hear the first part of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. It provides that "during the fiscal year 1932—"

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator read the amendment again?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it again, because I think the Senator will be inclined to accept it. It reads:

And provided further—

Mr. JONES. Where does the Senator propose to insert the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. After the word "herein," in line 16, on page 26, in place of the matter stricken out on page 26, I propose to insert the following:

And provided further, That within the fiscal year 1932 all the properties now owned by the United States Housing Corporation shall be sold at public or private sale and the proceeds paid into the Treasury of the United States.

That would end it.

Mr. JONES. I think I would be perfectly willing to agree to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, it is not in order; but I will offer it, and I hope that there will be no point of order raised against it. I believe it would be the best way to settle the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, this amendment will not get rid of the expenditure of \$26,154 this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it will not, but it will hereafter.

Mr. HOWELL. But we can save \$26,000, and that is about 15 per cent of the value of the vacant property.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senator does not contend that there will be no expense during the next year at all, does he?

Mr. HOWELL. Of course, there will be some expense.

Mr. JONES. The Senator said that we ought to save \$26,000. If we save \$26,000 that means we will spend nothing.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, there will be certain expenses, but the amount remitted will be remitted net; the collectors will take out their compensation, and with it there will be maintained here in Washington people to look after the collection of interest upon \$1,700,000, and look out for \$137,000 worth of vacant lots around the country. It is perfectly absurd to keep nine people here at that job; it is a sinecure. Why not, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, wipe out entirely this provision respecting the Housing Corporation, and then take care of what is necessary in the second deficiency appropriation bill? The way to get rid of it is to get rid of it, and not perpetuate it for a year. We will have the same fight over this item again another year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In view of the fact that the Senator from Washington objected, and would not let us have a

vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, I think we had better proceed in the regular order. I object to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee being offered at this time; and when the question comes on the committee amendment I wish to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is an amendment to the committee amendment, and would be in order unless a point of order were made that it is legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do I understand that the Senator from Tennessee is endeavoring to perfect the House text?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee proposes to amend the Senate committee amendment, as the Chair is advised.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In what way?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee moves to insert other language in lieu of the language inserted by the Senate committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The committee does not propose to insert any language; the committee proposes to strike out the House text.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But, in lieu of the provision proposed to be stricken out, the Senator from Tennessee proposes to amend and to insert certain words.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not object. If the amendment shall be adopted, then the question will arise as to whether the House language or the Senate language shall remain in the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish the Senator would let us have a vote on the other proposition, and then he can offer his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to do so, and I withdraw the amendment for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee withdraws his amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska has summed this thing up when he stated that we are maintaining a sinecure here. Of course, those who are enjoying the sinecure are very anxious to have it continue, and we find the chairman of the Appropriations Committee doing all he can to assist them.

I desire to read from a statement by Congressman WOODRUM, who was a member of the subcommittee that had charge of this bill in the House. It appears on page 3385 of the RECORD of January 27. Bear in mind the small amount of property which is the residue of the enormous holdings which this corporation at one time had.

Here is the pay roll, as given by Congressman WOODRUM, for the purpose of administering this comparatively small amount of property:

There is a director, who is president of the corporation, receiving \$5,000 a year; an assistant director with \$4,900; a special supervisor, \$3,600; an accountant, \$3,600; a law clerk, \$3,300; an auditor, \$3,300; a disbursing clerk, \$1,920; 3 clerks averaging \$1,527; a junior messenger; 1 employee at Bremerton, Wash.; 2 employees at Erie, Pa.; and 2 employees at Philadelphia.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has suggested that the way to handle this matter is to strike out all of the text in this bill relating to the Housing Corporation, and then provide in the second deficiency bill for whatever necessary administration there may be in some of the now existing offices of the Government, it does seem to me that that is the logical thing for the Senate to do. However, in view of the fact that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] did not desire to have that amendment presented, it seems to me that the next logical thing is to reject the committee amendment. That at least will provide a definite and specific means for terminating these sinecures and for transferring the activities of this corporation to the Department of Labor.

I sincerely hope that the committee amendment will be rejected; and then I hope that the Senator from Nebraska

[Mr. HOWELL] will offer his amendment to strike out all of the text of the bill dealing with the Housing Corporation, and that that may be adopted. That will rid us of this organization, and in my judgment it is the only way we will ever get rid of it. The people who are enjoying these salaries will be here at the next session of Congress importuning the committee to maintain their activities; and unless we cut this language out of the bill, we will have the same thing to go over again at the next session.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska a question. He was speaking about the \$1,700,000 of personal property, stocks, and bonds that the Housing Corporation owns, and the real estate. He said there was no income from the real estate. Can the Senator give us any idea of how much income there is from the personal property, the \$1,700,000?

Mr. HOWELL. If I remember rightly, about \$142,000 was collected in the way of interest in the previous year.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure there is a misapprehension regarding the situation concerning this item.

The Housing Corporation have yet to collect \$1,628,000 outstanding. They have unsold property amounting to \$137,000; and then they are operating what in effect is a building and loan association to manage the collections and to close up the business.

I should have no interest whatever in maintaining this corporation if any material saving to the country and to the taxpayer could be effected by transferring its activities to some other body. I knew nothing about it until the matter came up in the committee the other day, when these various witnesses appeared, and among others, Mr. Gompers, whom I have known for many years, who would have charge of this work if it were to go to the Department of Labor. Mr. Gompers said—and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out—that it would cost just as much to operate the business, to terminate this housing work, if it were taken over by the Department of Labor; and, further, that we would choke and interfere with the Department of Labor, because they have no way to house the employees, and no means at present of providing for them. Have I not stated the matter about as it is?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not remember that Mr. Gompers stated that it would cost as much. I do not think he made a statement with reference to the cost. He did say, however, that they were not prepared at all to take over the work; that they could not do it.

Mr. COPELAND. That is correct.

Furthermore, while I do not know what impression other members of the committee may have received, I have the impression that we expect the Housing Corporation to wind up this business; that within a couple of years it will be finished; and in the meantime the Department of Labor will be prepared to take care of any remnants or any left-overs that may be in existence at the time of the ultimate transfer. Certainly, however, if I am correctly informed, there is a real job for these people to do for some little time yet.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York was not present when the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] stated that that promise has been made every year since the war.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course I did not hear that; but I did hear the one I have recited—that it is thought now, and the decline of operations indicates, that there can be no excuse for continuing this appropriation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but there is not a corresponding decline in the salaries or the number of persons who are employed to look after this property.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator is entirely wrong. We have provided for a decrease; have we not?

Mr. JONES. We have provided for 8 instead of 13 employees for the current year.

Mr. COPELAND. We have provided for that. The Appropriations Committee has anticipated the thing that the Senator from Wisconsin has in his mind—that there will be a decreased personnel.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that we ought to fix a time for having this property sold and the proceeds turned into the Treasury?

Mr. COPELAND. I should say "Yes" in normal times, but we are not in normal times.

Mr. McKELLAR. This amendment would give them a year and a half.

Mr. COPELAND. We do not know what can be done in the next two years. Of course, after that the country will be prosperous, because the Democrats will be in control.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure of it.

Mr. COPELAND. But during the next two years there will be depression and economic disaster of one sort and another; and so we have to provide for that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It does seem to me that a director, an assistant director, a special supervisor, an accountant, a law clerk, an auditor, a disbursing clerk, three clerks, a junior messenger, one employee at Bremerton, Wash., two employees at Erie, Pa., and two employees at Philadelphia are a large number of persons to look after the collection of mortgages and about \$170,000 worth of vacant lots.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say that they have 13 employees for the current year? We provide for only eight for the next year.

Mr. COPELAND. We expect, Mr. President, that the Government shall be operated as economically as a private individual would operate his business; but we also expect that the Government shall be operated as well as a private individual would operate his business. It seems to me like a lot of money; but if a man had \$1,628,000 of collectible assets, and \$137,000 of unsold property, and a whole lot of arrangements where stuff is sold on the installment plan, a private individual—I do not care who he is—would have just as many employees as we are providing for here.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, here is an estate of \$1,700,000. In addition, there is \$130,000 worth of vacant property. Is there any Senator here who would employ eight persons to look after an estate of that character?

There are many real-estate concerns that have larger amounts of property than that scattered over the country. If they incurred the expense of eight persons at the central office simply to look after the correspondence in connection with the collection of these items they would simply be submersed; that is all. No private estate would do it, and there is no reason why the Government should do it.

The \$1,700,000 of securities represents property that has been sold; and these properties are not in the city of Washington, but they are outside. It is all done by correspondence. The purchasers are notified when they are in arrears. The money is paid into banks, and the banks remit. The idea of having eight persons here in this city, including a law clerk—think of it—to look after property like that is perfectly absurd.

Of course, if we do not care anything about efficient management, all well and good. My suggestion is that this should be conducted as a private business would be conducted; and I have no hesitation in saying that one experienced real-estate man with two or three clerks would more than look after all of this property and take care of it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have always dreaded the penalty of getting rich, because I thought if I did I should have to hire a lot of people. I find now, however, for the first time in my life, that if you have a couple of million dollars you do not need anybody to look after it; you can look after it yourself.

The Senator has spoken about an estate. Suppose he had an estate to administer. There would be the administrator and his stenographer, and there would be the probate judge and the assistant probate judge and three or four clerks in

the probate office, and there would be the prosecuting attorney of the county. Instead of 8 or 10, there would be 50 employees looking after an estate of that size.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I have not a doubt that there are a number of Senators here whose estates amount to that; and I warrant that they have not eight employees in a central office just looking after the collection of rents and looking after the income from mortgages.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all the titles have been passed upon. All these people have to do is to collect the rents, or else, if a sale is made, to collect the money. That is all there is to do in this institution.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the only advice we have had of any consequence, except that which has been given by Senators, has come from the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor has told us they can not operate it any more economically than it is being operated at present. Senators who are so accustomed to handling millions perhaps can testify that money comes in automatically, but in my small experience I have found that money does not come that way. I say that an estate of \$2,000,000 would require six or eight employees, and unless it were run by an automat you could not run it in any effective way unless you had those employees.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have noticed very frequently that no inference can be drawn from language used in debate here than that the motives of those who do not agree with the speaker are being impeached. I think it is very regretful that that happens, because those outside draw wrong conclusions. I do not think my good friend the Senator from Nebraska intended to impugn the motives of those who do not happen to agree with him as to what should be done; yet that is a legitimate inference to be drawn from his language. I do not take it that way myself, but I just call attention to that.

I am just as earnest in trying to protect the interests of the Government of the United States as is my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin or my good friend the Senator from Nebraska. I have no interest in anybody connected with this institution. I have no interest in the property or in the institution itself. All I want is to see it handled in the best possible way.

I confess that I have not had the handling of a million dollars' worth of property in my life. I do not know what it takes to handle a million dollars worth of real property scattered around over the country. I have had an idea, however, that it can not be handled with a penny, and that it can not be handled by a \$1,500 clerk. I think any institution which has assets estimated at a million five or six hundred thousand dollars and which has assets of \$130,000, or \$140,000 worth of property they expect to dispose of, will not be left in the hands of one or two persons drawing salaries of a thousand or \$2,000.

Whether we have too many people or not I am not prepared to say. We are cutting down the number of employees who are handling this property from 13 to 8. We are making that reduction at any rate. It might be wise to make a greater reduction. I am not prepared to say as to that. But it seemed to the committee, after we had heard Mr. Gompers, that it would be unwise to try to transfer this property and the care of the property to the Department of Labor. Mr. Gompers said emphatically, "We are not prepared to handle it." That simply means that if we do turn it over to them, they are going to employ an additional force in the Department of Labor. They will have to do so or else neglect the property.

It is suggested here that all these employees have to do is to be here in Washington City and collect money. I do not think that is the fact. I think they have to look after the property they have sold, and they have to make arrangements about collecting, about payments, and so on, and have to visit the different localities where they have the property in which the Government is interested.

The junior Senator from Nebraska knows better about how banks handle property than I do. I readily confess that. I have had practically no experience with banks or

with business of the banks, or anything of that sort. The Senator from Nebraska doubtless has had, and no doubt he knows how easy it is for a bank to collect payments on property that is sold, and so on. But I am inclined to think that if we had a million and a half dollars' worth of property scattered all around over the country we would have an attorney to look after our interests, to help us out in dealing with them; and we would have a manager, and probably would pay him more than \$5,000. We have reduced the pay of the present president of this corporation, and we must not overlook the fact that this property is all now in the hands of the Housing Corporation, organized under law. As I have said, we would have a manager to whom we would pay more than \$5,000. I may be wrong about that, because, as I have said, I have had no experience along that line. I never had any proposition to handle in that way. But I have been brought in contact with organizations and institutions which have great business interests, and I have heard about the compensation they pay to their managers, to the men they have looking after their business, and it has always been greater than \$5,000.

Mr. President, all the committee wants is to do the best it can for the interests of the Government of the United States. Upon the testimony we have had, and under the conditions which have been brought to our attention, we have felt that it was unwise to transfer this matter to the Department of Labor, as provided by the House.

We have felt that this business ought to be closed up within the next year or two. Of course, if they are directed to sell the property within the next year, they will do so, even though they get nothing for it. Does the Senate of the United States want to deal that way with the property of the people of the United States? After all, this million six or seven hundred thousand dollars' worth of property belongs to the people.

If we want to have it absolutely sacrificed, regardless of the real-estate conditions throughout the country, of course we can direct that that be done. If these experienced bankers, if these experienced millionaires, if these experienced gentlemen who have handled millions of dollars' worth of property and done millions of dollars' worth of business want to direct this agency, whatever it may be, to dispose of this property within the next year, of course that would be the verdict of the Senate, and it would be perfectly agreeable to me, whether I agree with the conclusion that is reached or not. I am simply trying to do what I think is right and for the best interests of the Government. I know that is what the other Senators are trying to do. I know there may be honest difference of opinion, and whatever method the Senate may decide upon is going to be entirely agreeable to me.

I think we ought to strike out this provision and take the matter to conference.

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, about a year ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement showing the number, the dates, and the places of the killing of 1,400 persons as a consequence of prohibition enforcement, people shot down as a consequence of modern methods. I now wish to add the names of 127 more persons who were killed in the year 1930 in the course of enforcing national prohibition, making the total toll to date, since 1920, 1,550. This is in consequence of the shotgun enforcement of the Constitution and the Volstead Act under which we have lived for the last 10 years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, has the Senator made any estimate as to how many would have been killed if there had been liquor in every homestead and upon every corner in the United States?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I have made such an estimate, and I have found that more people are dying now from alcoholism than died in the year of the greatest number of deaths from alcoholism before prohibition was adopted. I have also found that drunkenness has increased since prohibition was adopted rather than decreased, and here in the National Capital, where 55 persons under 21 years of age used to be arrested on an average for drunkenness the average since 1920 has risen to 275 a year, an increase of 400 per cent. That general consequence follows through all phases of national prohibition.

Mr. SMOOT. What I wanted to say was this: That the Senator may in his travels around the country, wherever he goes, notice this thing. I do not see such conditions. I think there are accidents to-day from drinking of poison whisky and there were accidents when the saloons were in operation, and where there was 1 automobile when the saloons were flourishing there are about 10 now during the dry régime.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator's colleague will indulge me just a moment, I may say that at the Army and Navy game held in Baltimore, in 1924, I think it was, attended by some 80,000 of our citizens, composed of Members of Congress, officers of the Army and Navy, governors, mayors, and Federal officials, together with their friends, after the game was over a thousand whisky flasks were picked up in the stadium. That was 1 to every 80 persons who attended the game. Certainly among the class of people who should abide by national prohibition the degree of lawlessness there exhibited shows that we need enforcement at the top more than we do at the bottom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, Washington, D. C., Sunday, February 1, 1931]

"SHOTGUN" PROHIBITION—TOLL NOW 1,550—ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN SLAIN LAST YEAR—HERALD FIGURES SHOW GHASTLY DRY TOLL—COVERS NATION—WOMEN, CHILDREN AMONG THOSE SACRIFICED

By Cole E. Morgan

The recorded death toll from 11 years of attempted enforcement of national prohibition is 1,550 men, women, and children.

The Washington Herald, a Hearst newspaper, has established undisputed records of this many dead. How many hundreds more may have lost their lives no one knows. But the Herald is positive its compilation falls far short of the actual total.

Fifteen hundred and fifty lives is the price on the books that America is known to have paid, to say nothing of the millions in money to enforce a law that 7 out of 11 members of the President's Law Enforcement Commission declare is not being and can not be enforced in its present form.

In December, 1929, the Washington Herald presented a record of 1,360 lives sacrificed to "shotgun enforcement" in the approximately 10 years of the life of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act. In the interim since that compilation and publication 190 additional deaths due directly to prohibition enforcement have been traced by the Herald.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY NEW DEATHS

The Herald has not undertaken to seek out these additional deaths. No canvass of the country has been undertaken. These 190 additional deaths have been recorded through publication from day to day and week to week in the daily newspapers and from the open records of the Federal Government bureaus and agencies having to do directly with prohibition enforcement.

The Herald's original compilation of 1,360 deaths on January 19, 1930, was reproduced in full, name for name and date for date, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by authority of the United States Senate. It was commended by that body to the attention of the Wickersham Commission.

HERALD'S REPORT

The circumstances surrounding the assembling of these data were made a matter of record by the Judiciary Committee of the House in the printed proceedings of the hearings conducted by that body last February into the question of prohibition and the eighteenth amendment. Four pages of that document and 28 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attest to the importance that Congress attached to the Herald's startling disclosures.

The accuracy and reliability of the Herald's presentation have never been challenged by any responsible authority either in or out of the Government.

Recorded in this additional tabulation of 190 are 127 fatalities in the year 1930. There were more than that last year. But

even this figure shows that the sacrifice of human lives on the altar of prohibition is still keeping well apace of prior years, even in the light of what had been revealed to the country more than a year ago.

In the 190 also are 37 additional enforcement deaths chargeable to the year 1929, bringing the total for that year to a high mark of 169 for the period since 1920. Also there are 26 new cases chargeable to prior years.

OVER WIDE AREA

The slaughter has not been confined to any one section. It has been general throughout the United States. In the Herald's original list of 1,360 killings, 47 of the 48 States and the District of Columbia were represented.

In the 190 new cases now added, two-thirds of the States—32 to be exact—and the District of Columbia are included. New Hampshire is the only State that has not a single killing of this character charged against it.

The additional list, bringing the record up through the year 1930, speaks for itself. It follows.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (WASHINGTON)

Frank L. Greene, United States Senator from Vermont, shot by Otis E. Fisher, Federal prohibition agent, February 15, 1924; died December 17, 1930.

Lamar W. York, Federal prohibition agent, killed by Martin Guy, John Logan, and Johnnie Borum, negroes, alleged bootleggers, April 12, 1930.

William Bell, negro, alleged bootlegger, killed by Eugene Jackson, accompanied by Murray C. Taylor and John T. Weigel, all Federal prohibition agents, January 7, 1930.

Edward Smith, negro, police informer, killed by Leon T. Brown and Lawrence Bias, negroes, alleged bootleggers, March 13, 1929.

Clarence Harvey, negro, police informer, killed in gun battle with alleged bootleggers, Leon T. Brown, Lawrence Bias, and Theodore Smith, negroes, accused, March 13, 1929.

William Bradley, negro, alleged bootlegger, died in jail from wounds received in above encounter, March, 1929.

Purcell, policeman, killed by person unknown, alleged bootlegger, October 17, 1924.

Total..... 7
Previously recorded..... 7

Total, District of Columbia..... 14

ALABAMA

Cherokee County (Center, county seat): Person unknown, killed in still raid by officers, names unknown, 1921.

Mobile County (Mobile, county seat): Mrs. Thelma Wooten, occupation unknown, killed by T. H. Sullivan, deputy sheriff, and C. C. Lane, railroad special officer, August 28, 1930.

Total..... 2
Previously recorded..... 75

Total, Alabama..... 77

ARKANSAS

Lafayette County (Lewistown, county seat): Oscar Call, alleged moonshiner, killed by R. R. Duty, sheriff, and Bryan Cryer, deputy sheriff, January 26, 1930.

Lawrence County (Walnut Ridge, county seat): Henry McMurcher, alleged moonshiner, killed by C. E. Meadows, deputy sheriff, about March 21, 1930.

Ouachita County (Camden, county seat): E. R. Marsh, town marshal of Chidester, Ark., killed by Walter Patterson, alleged bootlegger, July 7, 1929. Walter Patterson, alleged bootlegger, killed by Luther Meeks, constable, July 7, 1929.

Poinsett County (Harrisburg, county seat): Cloy Kelley, alleged rum runner, killed by W. R. Adams, chief of police of Lepanto, Ark., May 24, 1930. George Laudermilks, occupation unknown, innocent bystander, killed by stray shot in same encounter, May 24, 1930; Ira Williams, alleged rumrunner, killed by some one in same encounter, May 24, 1930; Walter Mobbs, alleged rum runner, killed in same encounter, May 24, 1930.

Sebastian County (Greenwood, county seat): George Hodge, miner, killed by own hand after shooting Robert Ransome, town marshal of Bonanza, Ark., February 16, 1930.

Total..... 9
Previously recorded..... 35

Total, Arkansas..... 44

CALIFORNIA

Marin County (San Rafael, county seat): M. G. Sturtevant, occupation unknown, Government witness in liquor case, killed by person unknown, May 21, 1930.

Modoc County (Alturas, county seat): Albert L. Brown, Federal prohibition agent, killed by Rodney Selby, alleged bootlegger, June 9, 1930.

Monterey County (Salinas, county seat): Child of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur M. Brown, died at birth when mother was jailed on trumped-up liquor charge by D. H. Laughry, county prohibition officer, on warrant issued by Justice of the Peace Ray Baugh, January 14, 1930.

Napa County (Napa, county seat): Robert D. Freeman, Federal prohibition agent, killed by John South, alleged bootlegger, December 29, 1929.

Riverside County (Riverside, county seat): Oscar E. Olson, special officer, United States Indian Service, killed by Clarence Hyde, 19, Indian, October 26, 1930.

Sonoma County (Santa Rosa, county seat): Hugo Prasso, rancher, killed by M. J. Buckley, Federal prohibition agent, December 12, 1930.

Total..... 6
Previously recorded..... 29

Total, California..... 35

COLORADO

Las Animas County (Trinidad, county seat): Dale F. Kearney, Federal prohibition agent, killed by person unknown, occupation unknown, July 6, 1930.

Logan County (Sterling, county seat): Girl, 16, name unknown, killed by State police officer, name unknown, 1922.

Total..... 2
Previously recorded..... 23

Total, Colorado..... 25

FLORIDA

Duval County (Jacksonville, county seat): Person unknown, alleged moonshiner, killed by Joe Haywood, deputy sheriff, about March, 1929.

Indian River County (Vero Beach, county seat): Charles W. Rogers, United States customs officer, killed in automobile accident on official duty, September 24, 1929.

Monroe County (Key West, county seat): Willie Demerritt, seaman, alleged rumrunner, killed in encounter with United States Coast Guard patrol boat, No. 9170. Boatswain H. B. Bowery, commanding, October 30, 1930.

Palm Beach County (West Palm Beach, county seat): Franklin R. Patterson, Federal prohibition agent, killed by George Moore, alleged bootlegger, January 18, 1930. Robert K. Moncure, Federal prohibition agent, killed by George Moore, alleged bootlegger, January 18, 1930.

Total..... 5
Previously recorded..... 47

Total, Florida..... 52

GEORGIA

Atkinson County (Pearson, county seat): Palmer R. Corbett, alleged moonshiner, killed by Ed. White, deputy sheriff, July 22, 1930.

Berrien County (Nashville, county seat): Isaac K. Luke, 65, alleged bootlegger, killed by J. C. Jernigan, county policeman, April 20, 1930.

Bill County (Macon, county seat): Herman Warr, informer for Federal prohibition agents, killed by person unknown in gun battle between alleged rumrunners and prohibition agents. A. Lamar Patterson, planter, accused, August 1, 1930. Sam Knight, negro, teamster, killed in same encounter by Federal prohibition agents, names unknown, August 1, 1930.

Chatham County (Savannah, county seat): William Lane, alias Frasier, alleged rumrunner, killed by Owen C. Strickland, Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by Marvin L. Beard and Walter C. Grubbs, also Federal agents, June 11, 1930.

Colquitt County (Moultrie, county seat): "Dink" Lovett, farmer, killed by John Beard, town marshal of Norman Park, Ga., March, 1930.

Fayette County (Fayetteville, county seat): Will Collins, farmer, alleged prohibition informer, killed by J. O. Thomas, alleged bootlegger; Marvin Sutton and Ed Smith, alleged bootleggers, also accused, March, 1930.

Fulton County (Atlanta, county seat): J. Tom Brown, bailiff, killed in automobile wreck during rum chase, accompanied by Johnny Jones, special investigator, and O. B. Powell and W. A. Carroll, policemen, all officers of DeKalb County, December 2, 1930. Aaron B. Roberts, Atlanta policeman, killed by Nick D. Camp, restaurant proprietor, June 18, 1930. Nick D. Camp killed by John D. Wood, policeman, June 18, 1930.

Muscogee County (Columbus, county seat): Ray Rogers, 20, alleged bootlegger, killed by W. K. Johnston, jr., Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by George Moseley, undercover agent, July 25, 1930.

Spalding County (Griffin, county seat): Emmett Ison, ex-convict, killed by James Henderson, policeman, April 27, 1930.

Taylor County (Butler, county seat): Homer Bazemore, deputy sheriff, killed by persons unknown, alleged rumrunners, August 16, 1930.

Whitfield County (Dalton, county seat): Alfred Wilson, farmer, deputized with three others by Needham Kennemer, bailiff, to accompany him on a roadhouse raid, killed by Bill Walker, September 22, 1930. Frank Anderson, farmer, alleged prohibition informer, killed by Newt Brewster, alleged moonshiner, September 28, 1930.

Total..... 15
Previously recorded..... 105

Total, Georgia..... 120

ILLINOIS

Alexander County (Cairo, county seat): Herbert Coryell, deputy sheriff, killed by Minus Dunning, alleged moonshiner, September 4, 1930.

Cumberland County (Toledo, county seat): William Grubb, occupation unknown, killed by John Ryan, sheriff, about 1924.

Franklin County (Benton, county seat): Earl Kreiger, alleged bootlegger, killed by LeRoy Sisk, chief of police of West Frankfort, Ill., accompanied by George Nipper, patrolman, August 21, 1929. Albert McDonald, alleged bootlegger, killed by Chief of Police Sisk in same encounter August 21, 1929.

Total 4
Previously recorded 39

Total, Illinois 43

INDIANA

Hendricks County (Danville, county seat): Harley Oxley, farmer, killed himself to escape trial on prohibition law charge January 10, 1930.

Vigo County (Terre Haute, county seat): James O. Booth, engineer, killed by Robert Stewart, motor-cycle policeman, March 24, 1930.

Total 2
Previously recorded 23

Total, Indiana 25

KANSAS

Elk County (Howard, county seat): J. D. Ellsworth, alleged rumrunner, killed by W. P. Brown, sheriff, September 8, 1929.

Total 1
Previously recorded 14

Total, Kansas 15

KENTUCKY

Bell County (Pineville, county seat): Tip Cook, policeman, killed by William Smith, deputy sheriff, December 4, 1930. William Smith, deputy sheriff, killed by posse of officers, including Charles Steware, chief of police, and Eugene Felton, patrolman, December 4, 1930. Hiram Fee, former city councilman, killed by person unknown. Bert Epperson, constable; Jim Frank Lester, taxicab driver; and Alinous Smith, occupation unknown, accused August 13, 1930.

Madison County (Richmond, county seat): Ambrose Williams, farmer, killed by Lloyd Lane, deputy sheriff, accompanied by Albert Bogher, sheriff, and Boyd Sandlin, United States deputy marshal, March 30, 1930.

Nelson County (Bardstown, county seat): Omer Alford, alleged highjacker, posing as prohibition agent, killed by sheriff's posse, names unknown, after Alford and six companions had raked farmhouse with machine-gun fire when attempted search was resisted, July 11, 1930.

Total 5
Previously recorded 79

Total, Kentucky 84

LOUISIANA

Lincoln County (Ruston, county seat): Philip Harris, farmer, killed by S. G. Thigpen, sheriff, December 26, 1929.

Total 1
Previously recorded 29

Total, Louisiana 30

MAINE

Cumberland County (Portland, county seat): Michael T. Connolly, policeman, killed by persons unknown, suspected bootleggers, August 15, 1930.

Total 1
Previously recorded 1

Total, Maine 2

MASSACHUSETTS

Essex County (Newburyport, county seat): Lewis E. Pratt, boat-swain, United States Coast Guard, killed by gunfire from another Coast Guard vessel when his life-saving surfboat was mistaken for a rum runner, August 4, 1930.

Suffolk County (Boston, county seat): Victor L. Harris, boat-swain's mate, United States Coast Guard, witness in rumrunning cases, killed by person unknown believed to be rum runner, February 1, 1930.

Total 2
Previously recorded 4

Total, Massachusetts 6

MICHIGAN

Wayne County (Detroit, county seat): Walter Grund, alleged rumrunner, killed by Clare B. Hopper, United States Customs border-patrol officer, accompanied by William H. Redford, also a border-patrol officer, January 22, 1930. Arthur N. Beeman, United States Customs officer, accidentally drowned on official duty July 23, 1929. Clarence N. Titcomb, United States Customs officer, killed in collision of his automobile with interurban car while on official duty January 15, 1929. Four men, unknown, alleged rumrunners, drowned in encounter with United States customs officers December 27, 1930. Barney Roth, special investigator for Ham-

tramck police, killed by persons unknown, alleged bootleggers, July 5, 1930. Johnny Mietz, alleged bootlegger, killed in same encounter, July 5, 1930.

Total 9
Previously recorded 44

Total, Michigan 53

MISSISSIPPI

Coahoma County (Clarksdale, county seat): J. L. Doggett, planter, killed by E. S. Chapman, Federal prohibition agent, March 25, 1930.

Forrest County (Hattiesburg, county seat): Earl Gray, 19, killed by posse of three deputy sheriffs, names unknown, August 1, 1930.

Marshall County (Holly Springs, county seat): Lloyd Gurley, former district inspector of State highways, killed by posse composed of Butler Overton and three other deputy sheriffs, December 27, 1930; Glenn Gurley, brother of Lloyd Gurley, killed in same encounter, December 27, 1930; Dave Sanders, farmer, killed by Butler Overton, deputy sheriff, December 30, 1930.

Tunica County (Tunica, county seat): One "Jenks," alleged moonshiner, killed by A. S. Campbell, Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by W. H. Wright, Federal agent, and R. H. Kennedy, informer, October 25, 1929.

Webster County (Walthall, county seat): Mrs. Lee M. Ferguson, wife of magistrate, killed by stray bullet in gun battle between a posse of officers, including her husband and Bynum Putnam and A. Y. Vaughn, deputy sheriffs, and Tom Elkins, 19; Watts Bower, about the same age; T. D. Castle, 18; and Archie Morris, 23, June 8, 1930.

Total 7
Previously reported 49

Total, Mississippi 56

MISSOURI

Adair County (Kirkville, county seat): John Rose, 65, night marshal of Kirkville, Mo., killed by person unknown; suspected rumrunner, November 17, 1930.

Jackson County (Kansas City, county seat): Garfield Buckner, negro, alleged bootlegger, killed by L. B. Shoemaker, Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by George P. Small, F. D. Seaton, Robert Reece, Arthur J. Lacey, and Sidney W. Thomas, Federal agents, December 14, 1929.

Total 2
Previously recorded 25

Total, Missouri 27

NEW JERSEY

Union County (Elizabeth, county seat): G. Finiello, Federal prohibition agent, killed by person unknown, alleged illicit-brewery gangster, Sam Grossman, alias George Green, accused, September 19, 1930.

Total 1
Previously recorded 20

Total, New Jersey 21

NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo County (Albuquerque, county seat): Emilio Candelaria, deputy sheriff, killed by Gregerio Espinosa, alleged bootlegger, January 29, 1930; Waldo Martinez, State highway employee, killed by C. W. Eskildson, Federal prohibition agent, October 26, 1930.

Colfax County (Raton, county seat): Roy Sutton, Federal prohibition agent, killed by persons unknown, alleged bootleggers, October, 1930.

Valencia County (Las Lunas, county seat): Bonifacio Torres, 16, occupation unknown, killed by Reymendo Lovato, deputy sheriff, after youth had shot and seriously wounded three other officers, March 1, 1930.

Total 4
Previously recorded 11

Total, New Mexico 15

NEW YORK

Erie County (Buffalo, county seat): Eugene F. Downey, jr., alleged rumrunner, killed by crew of United States Coast Guard cutter, including Rudolph Thompson, Asa Ennis, and Orville Lafrant, December 25, 1929.

New York County (New York, county seat): Joseph Casey, jr., 16, occupation unknown, killed by William Murphy, police detective, June 7, 1930. Daniel Flynn, alleged bootlegger and highjacker, killed by George Schuchman, policeman, September 13, 1929.

Westchester County (White Plains, county seat): Philip Piscitello, alleged rumrunner, killed by Charles LaForge, State trooper, July 9, 1930.

Total 4
Previously recorded 50

Total, New York State 54

NORTH CAROLINA

Columbus County (Whiteville, county seat): Hoke B. Smith, deputy sheriff, killed by Woodell Millican, Buford Floyd, Sam Lineberry, and Sam Thompson, December 31, 1929.

Henderson County (Hendersonville, county seat): Clarence Howard, Federal prohibition agent, killed by Fred Schwartz, alleged rumrunner, April 22, 1930.

Madison County (Marshall, county seat): Wiley Trantham, farmer, killed in gun battle with Dewey Foster, Lester Foster, and Wesley Foster, deputy sheriffs, August 13, 1930.

Onslow County (Jacksonville, county seat): Roy Gurganius, alleged moonshiner, killed by S. K. Hughes, Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by O. A. McCaskell and T. C. Wilkins, Federal agents, and Clyde McCall, informer, April 9, 1930.

Pamlico County (Bayboro, county seat): Louis M. Davies, Federal prohibition agent, killed by Solomon Guion, negro, alleged moonshiner, January 14, 1930.

Wayne County (Goldsboro, county seat): Posey L. Flinchum, Federal prohibition agent, killed by persons unknown, alleged rumrunners, June 17, 1930.

Total 6
Previously recorded 36

Total, North Carolina 42

OHIO

Butler County (Hamilton, county seat): Daniel Sandlin, policeman, killed by persons unknown, alleged bootleggers, March 20, 1930.

Cuyahoga County (Cleveland, county seat): Samuel Weinstein, 13, killed by automobile driven by Albert Collins, Federal prohibition agent, on official duty, April 25, 1926.

Lucas County (Toledo, county seat): Ralph Zolmie, deputy marshal, killed by persons unknown, alleged rumrunners, November 7, 1929.

Ottawa County (Port Clinton, county seat): Gardner D. Young, chief boatswain, United States Coast Guard, died from exposure following sinking of Coast Guard patrol boat CG-8010 in rum chase, about May 1, 1930. William Platt, chief machinists' mate, same, about May 1, 1930. John C. Hay, first class, motor machinist, drowned in same shipwreck, about May 1, 1930.

Total 6
Previously recorded 49

Total, Ohio 55

OKLAHOMA

Jackson County (Altus, county seat): Elmer L. Carter, deputy sheriff, killed by Vernon Robson, George Robson, and Ernest Jackson, alleged moonshiners, August 29, 1930.

Kiowa County (Hobart, county seat): S. W. Humble, deputy sheriff, killed by Sam Allen, filling-station proprietor, alleged bootlegger, June 11, 1930.

Payne County (Stillwater, county seat): Otto P. Butler, Federal prohibition agent, killed by John Young and his wife, Latosca Young, negroes, alleged bootleggers, December 10, 1929.

Tulsa County (Tulsa, county seat): George Lewis, alias George Lewis Redding, alleged bootlegger, killed by William F. Wolverton, Federal prohibition agent, accompanied by Henry B. Jones and Maurice E. Craig, Federal agents, February 24, 1930.

Total 4
Previously recorded 32

Total, Oklahoma 36

OREGON

Lane County (Eugene, county seat): Joseph Saunders, deputy game warden, killed by Ray ("Vic") Sutherland, 68, alleged moonshiner, August 28, 1930; Oscar Duly, policeman, killed by Sutherland in same encounter, August 28, 1930; Vic Sutherland, alleged moonshiner, killed by posse headed by John Carlisle, deputy sheriff, November 25, 1930.

Total 3
Previously recorded 17

Total, Oregon 20

RHODE ISLAND

Newport County (Newport, county seat): Dudley A. Brandt, marine engineer of the speed boat *Black Duck*, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by crew of U. S. Coast Guard cutter CG-290, December 29, 1929; Jack Wisemann, alleged liquor smuggler, killed in same encounter, December 29, 1929; John Goulart, alleged liquor smuggler, same, December 29, 1929.

Total 3
Previously recorded 2

Total, Rhode Island 5

SOUTH CAROLINA

Berkeley County (Moncks Corner, county seat): Edward J. Dennis, State senator, killed by W. L. ("Sporty") Thornley, gunman and alleged moonshiner, alleged to have been hired by Glenn McKnight, former Federal prohibition agent; Clarence Woodward, former deputy sheriff; Curtis Thornley, brother of "Sporty"; and Fred Artis, all alleged moonshiners and bootleggers, July 24, 1930; Five other persons previously killed in attempts to clean up moonshining, rumrunning, and bootlegging in the Hell Hole Swamp section of Berkeley County, three of these prior to 1927. Details of these killings not ascertained.

Greenville County (Greenville, county seat): Mack Parsons, Federal prohibition agent, killed in wreck of his automobile in rum chase, September 20, 1930. Perry Paris, deputy sheriff, killed when struck by a passing automobile while pursuing, on foot, an alleged bootlegger, name unknown, October 24, 1930. Sam D. Willis, sheriff, killed by Blair Rook, negro, alleged to have been hired by Carlos A. Rector, former sheriff, and J. Harmon Moore, former deputy sheriff, June 12, 1927.

Sumter County (Sumter, county seat): Ezra Hodge, farmer, suspected of reporting a still, killed by Caser Cockrell, alleged tool of Frank Jennings, alleged moonshiner, June 12, 1930.

Total 10
Previously recorded 33

Total, South Carolina 43

TENNESSEE

Claiborne County (Tazewell, county seat): John Arnold, occupation unknown, suspected of being a revenue officer, killed by John Johnson, alleged moonshiner, January 30, 1930.

Davidson County (Nashville, county seat): John B. Martin, deputy sheriff, killed by Brice Adams, negro, fireman, December 25, 1929.

Franklin County (Winchester, county seat): Thomas Morris, alleged moonshiner, killed by Buford Rader, ex-convict, deputized as officer, accompanied by Fred M. Curtis, Federal prohibition agent, and Ashburn, sheriff, January 26, 1930.

Greene County (Greenville, county seat): Mitchell Gentry, deputy sheriff of Madison County, N. C., killed in gun battle in which Pete and Hubert Schanlon and Fowler Shelton, farmers, were the alleged aggressors, May 4, 1930.

Hawkins County (Rogersville, county seat): Farris Ward, deputy sheriff, killed by Terry Alvis, farmer, Ward's cousin, December 17, 1930.

Jefferson County (Jefferson City, county seat): T. B. Younce, chief of police, killed by Charlie Newman, alleged bootlegger, September 5, 1930.

Knox County (Knoxville, county seat): R. L. Hughett, United States deputy marshal, killed by Harrison Welch, alleged bootlegger, June 12, 1930; Charles Gammon, alleged moonshiner, killed by A. McPherson, deputy sheriff, accompanied by Ott Wagner, deputy sheriff, and Luke Robbins, deputized citizen, April 24, 1930.

Lewis County (Hohenwald, county seat): Two officers, names unknown, killed by persons unknown, alleged moonshiners, June, 1930.

Putnam County (Cookeville, county seat): Orville A. Moss, deputy sheriff, killed by Hop Anderson, alleged rumrunner and moonshiner, April 22, 1930.

Sevier County (Sevierville, county seat): A. C. Matthews, 65, farmer, killed from ambush by persons unknown, alleged moonshiner, after he had reported a still; Odie Grooms and Leonard Nicholson, alias Baker, accused; on or about May 4, 1930.

Shelby County (Memphis, county seat): Clara Patterson, hotel cashier, prohibition informer, killed by persons unknown, believed to be bootleggers, August 9, 1930.

Union County (Erwin, county seat): Cass Atkins, escaped convict, alleged moonshiner, killed by sheriff's posse, names unknown, January 18, 1930.

Weakley County (Dresden, county seat): Walter McDaniel, occupation unknown, killed by posse of officers including Bonnie Bullock, sheriff, and Will Dunn, Finis Summers, Richard Maiden, and Egbert Bullock, deputy sheriffs. Date not ascertained.

Total 15
Previously recorded 72

Total, Tennessee 87

TEXAS

El Paso County (El Paso, county seat): Francisco Beltram, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by Clarence R. Rogers, United States customs officer, accompanied by William White, customs officer, March 26, 1930. Manuel Martinez, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by United States border patrolmen, names unknown, March 6, 1930. Manuel E. Strada, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by United States border patrolmen, names unknown, December 26, 1929. Pedro Rodriguez, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by United States border patrolmen, names unknown, February 23, 1930. Frank Barncastle, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by posse of United States customs officers, including Manuel D. Abeyta, William T. Coe, Milton R. Rogers, and John H. Shaffer, November 19, 1930. Jesus Esparaza, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by posse of United States Customs officers, including above, November 19, 1930. Felipe Regalado, Mexican, liquor smuggler, killed by posse of United States customs officers, name unknown, June 18, 1930. Charles Gardner, United States border patrolman, killed by Mexicans, names unknown, alleged liquor smugglers, October 20, 1922.

Hidalgo County (Edinburg, county seat): Bert Ellison, United States customs officer, killed by Mexicans, names unknown, alleged liquor smugglers, August 9, 1930.

Jim Wells County (Alice, county seat): William D. McGaleb, United States customs officer, killed by Pedro Rendon, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, January 7, 1930. Pedro Rendon, Mexican, alleged smuggler, hanged himself in jail while awaiting trial for killing Customs Officer McGaleb, February 7, 1930.

Kinney County (Bracketville, county seat): Daniels, occupation unknown, killed by sheriff's posse, names unknown, early in 1924. Two Mexicans, names unknown, alleged liquor smugglers, killed by posse of officers headed by Romas Salmon, sheriff, and including deputy sheriffs and prohibition agents, late in 1923.

Walker County (Huntsville, county seat): Joyce Shepard, farmer, electrocuted for killing in 1927 of Jake Owens and Bob Smith, deputy sheriffs of Fisher County, Tex., October 16, 1930.

Webb County (Laredo, county seat): Robert W. "Red" Kelsey, United States border patrolman, killed by persons unknown, alleged liquor smugglers, August 25, 1930. Juan Espinosa, Mexican, alleged liquor smuggler, killed by United States border patrolmen, names unknown, August 29, 1930.

Total 17
Previously recorded 114

Total, Texas 131

VIRGINIA

Accomac County (Accomac, county seat): Clayton Townsend, alleged bootlegger, killed in rum chase, C. D. Andrews and Elsie Justice, State troopers, accused, February 26, 1930.

Amherst County (Amherst, county seat): Ernest Grant, alleged moonshiner, killed by Talley Stinnett, deputized as Federal prohibition officer, 1929.

Buchanan County (Grundy, county seat): Hyson Baker, constable, killed in gun battle between officers and alleged moonshiners, in which Baker, Howard Justus, and David J. Smith, deputy sheriffs, and Earl, Tom, Clark, May, Harman, and Thomps Dotson and Ballard and Hillman Tester were participants, July 9, 1930. Thomps Dotson, alleged moonshiner, killed in same encounter, July 9, 1930.

Hanover County (Ashland, county seat): Harry V. Sweeman, chief of police, killed by person unknown, alleged bootlegger, June 29, 1929.

Mecklenburg County (Boydton, county seat): Bernard A. Puryear, county officer, killed by Garland Smith, alleged moonshiner, December 29, 1929. Mack E. Tuck, chief of police of Clarksville, Va., killed by Garland Smith, alleged moonshiner, December 29, 1929.

Norfolk County (Portsmouth, county seat): Jeff Miller, prohibition officer, killed by person unknown, occupation unknown, date unknown. Payne, prohibition officer, same. M. L. Cherry, prohibition officer, killed by person unknown, occupation unknown, February, 1929. Powell boy, 13 or 14, killed by officer, name unknown, date unknown.

Pittsylvania County (Chatham, county seat): Clarence Trent, special deputy State prohibition agent, killed by person unknown, alleged moonshiner, June 7, 1930.

Richmond County (Warsaw, county seat): James Newton Wood, State prohibition officer, killed by Randolph C. Cox, negro farmer, alleged bootlegger, December 19, 1930.

Wise County (Big Stone Gap, county seat): Walter Caudell, alleged rum runner, killed by two deputy sheriffs, names unknown, March 6, 1930.

Total 14
Previously recorded 73

Total, Virginia 87

WASHINGTON

Clark County (Camas, county seat): Carmi M. Weidman, laborer, alleged bootlegger, killed by E. J. Crum, policeman, December 4, 1929.

Snohomish County (Everett, county seat): Al Kinsman, rancher, alleged bootlegger, killed by Jessy Jackson, deputy sheriff, accompanied by George I. Stever, sheriff, and J. W. Thomas, deputy sheriff, February 12, 1930.

Total 2
Previously recorded 23

Total, Washington 25

WEST VIRGINIA

Berkeley County (Martinsburg, county seat): Lorentz Marino, 17, son of Louis Marino, constable, killed by Dorsey Lamb, quarry worker, alleged bootlegger, September, 1930.

Cabell County (Huntington, county seat): Chesley Childers, youth, killed by J. T. Poe, State prohibition agent, 1925. Harry Lane, negro, alleged bootlegger, killed by Earl Long, special policeman, July 20, 1930.

Hampshire County (Romney, county seat): H. Carter Inskeep, magistrate, killed by Walter Crabtree, convicted liquor violator, December 18, 1929. Ben A. Miller, constable, killed in same encounter, December 18, 1929. Asa Wolford, constable, same, December 18, 1929.

Jefferson County (Charles Town, county seat): John Twyman, negro, alleged bootlegger, drowned while fleeing from Federal prohibition agents and county officers, names unknown, January 23, 1930.

Mercer County (Princeton, county seat): Ed Neely, alleged moonshiner, killed by — Watkins, officer, 1922. Gilbert Pennington, constable, killed by persons unknown, alleged bootleggers, 1922. Leslie Cox, alleged bootlegger, killed by Alfred Clark, deputy sheriff, December 25, 1922. Alfred Clark, deputy sheriff, killed by Leslie Cox, alleged bootlegger, December 25, 1922. Charlie Campbell, occupation unknown, killed by — Watkins, officer,

1923. Boy, 18, name unknown, killed by — Watkins, officer, 1923. Boy, 16, name unknown, alleged moonshiner, killed by State and county officers, names unknown, 1925. Person unknown, negro, occupation unknown, killed by deputy sheriff, name unknown. McBride, occupation unknown, killed by — Watkins, officer, December, 1929. Dave Maye, alleged moonshiner, killed by Powers, State policeman, January 29, 1929.

Mongalla County (Morgantown, county seat): Richard Stine, police sergeant, shot in liquor raid about 1926, by person unknown, died some time later.

Total 18
Previously recorded 49

Total, West Virginia 67

WISCONSIN

Grant County (Lancaster, county seat): Edward Foht, alleged moonshiner, killed by Joseph Greer, sheriff, April 24, 1930.

Mauston County (Mauston, county seat): Clinton G. Price, district attorney, killed by person unknown; Lyall T. Wright, former sheriff, accused April 13, 1930.

Total 2
Previously recorded 12

Total, Wisconsin 14

WYOMING

Albany County (Laramie, county seat): — Kennedy, cattleman, killed by three Federal prohibition agents, two identified as "Tony" and "Henry," ex-convicts, 1922.

Total 1
Previously recorded 12

Total, Wyoming 13

STATE SUMMARY OF BOOTLEG TOLL

Here is the death toll in the 11-year attempt to enforce the eighteenth amendment, the Volstead and other Federal prohibition laws, and the dry statutes of the States that has claimed a known total of 1,550 lives and an untold number of which there is no available record:

	Officers and aides	Civilians	Total
District of Columbia.....	7	7	14
Alabama.....	20	57	77
Arizona.....	2	7	9
Arkansas.....	9	35	44
California.....	15	20	35
Colorado.....	8	17	25
Connecticut.....	2	1	3
Delaware.....	0	1	1
Florida.....	19	33	52
Georgia.....	42	78	120
Idaho.....	4	4	8
Illinois.....	21	22	43
Indiana.....	8	17	25
Iowa.....	4	9	13
Kansas.....	0	15	15
Kentucky.....	29	55	84
Louisiana.....	10	20	30
Maine.....	1	1	2
Maryland.....	6	6	12
Massachusetts.....	3	3	6
Michigan.....	13	40	53
Minnesota.....	3	7	10
Mississippi.....	11	45	56
Missouri.....	8	19	27
Montana.....	3	5	8
Nebraska.....	6	17	23
Nevada.....	1	2	3
New Hampshire.....	0	0	0
New Jersey.....	4	17	21
New Mexico.....	5	10	15
New York.....	10	44	54
North Carolina.....	15	27	42
North Dakota.....	0	1	1
Ohio.....	25	30	55
Oklahoma.....	15	21	36
Oregon.....	7	13	20
Pennsylvania.....	10	14	24
Rhode Island.....	2	3	5
South Carolina.....	22	21	43
South Dakota.....	2	4	6
Tennessee.....	31	56	87
Texas.....	32	99	131
Utah.....	1	2	3
Vermont.....	1	2	3
Virginia.....	22	65	87
Washington.....	6	19	25
West Virginia.....	22	45	67
Wisconsin.....	3	11	14
Wyoming.....	4	9	13
Total, United States.....	494	1,056	1,550

DRY DEATH TOLL SHOWN BY YEARS

The record of the years in prohibition enforcement killings shows 1929 to have been the peak, according to the compilation of 1,550 casualties made by the Washington Herald for the 11 years from 1920 to 1930, inclusive. The figures provide material for an interesting study. They follow:

	Officers and aides	Civilians	Total
1920.....	20	40	60
1921.....	38	75	113
1922.....	44	67	111
1923.....	33	66	99
1924.....	42	106	148
1925.....	49	97	146
1926.....	37	79	116
1927.....	56	97	153
1928.....	41	87	128
1929.....	59	110	169
1930.....	65	62	127
Not reported.....	10	170	180
Total.....	494	1,056	1,550

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I request that there be printed in the RECORD an article published in the national weekly known as America under date of February 7, 1931. It contains a series of quotations upon the Wickersham report. The edition of the paper of this week also contains an editorial entitled "An Unacceptable Amendment." I ask that that also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PICTURE OF PROHIBITION

Paul L. Blakely, S. J.

The French press is puzzled by the Wickersham report, and the British public is muddled. At home there is dispute in the Senate, and elsewhere, about the lacunae in the report, and on what President Hoover thinks about the whole performance. To all of us it is in some degree like Tom Sawyer's emancipation plan—splendid, possibly, but a bit mixed up.

Yet I think that a series of quotations from this official paper (H. Doc. No. 732, 71st Cong.) can paint a vivid picture of prohibition after 10 years of experimentation. Mr. Wickersham vouches for the facts, all of which have been published in these pages at one time or other since 1920. I proceed to quote, then, without comment, first from the report and next from the individual opinions.

THE REPORT

The amendment and the national prohibition act inaugurated one of the most extensive and sweeping efforts to change the social habits of an entire nation recorded in history. It would naturally have been assumed that the enforcement of such a novel and sweeping reform in a democracy would have been undertaken cautiously, with a carefully selected and specially trained force adequately organized and compensated, accompanied by efforts to arouse to its support public sympathy and aid. No opportunity for such a course was allowed. Considerable public sentiment was, however, antagonized by the legislative fixing of the permissible content of alcohol at a percentage considerably below the possibility of intoxication (pp. 10-11).

Votes in colleges show an attitude of hostility to or contempt for the law on the part of those who are not unlikely to be leaders in the next generation. It is safe to say that a significant change has taken place in the social attitude toward drinking. This may be seen in the views and conduct of social leaders, business and professional men in the average community. It may be seen in the tolerance of conduct at social gatherings which would not have been possible a generation ago. It is reflected in a different way of regarding drunken youth, in a change in the class of excessive drinkers, and in the increased use of distilled liquor in places and connections where it was formerly banned. It is evident that, taking the country as a whole, people of wealth, business men and professional men, and their families, and, perhaps, the higher-paid working men and their families, are drinking in large numbers in quite frank disregard of the declared policy of the national prohibition act (p. 21).

Upon the whole, however, they [the death rates] indicate that after a brief period in the first years of the amendment there has been a steady increase in drinking (p. 22).

In consequence of the high development of illicit distilling, a steady volume of whisky, much of it of good quality, is put in circulation (p. 29).

In some parts of the country enormous sums of money are derived from the business of illicit beer (p. 31).

Necessity seems to compel the virtual abandonment of efforts for effective enforcement at this point (liquor production in the home!) but it must be recognized that this is done at the price of nullification to that extent (p. 33).

It is common knowledge, and a general cause of dissatisfaction with enforcement of the national prohibition act, that the big operators or headmen in the traffic are rarely caught (p. 36).

Whisky of good quality is obtainable substantially everywhere at prices not extravagant for persons of means. It is true many can not afford these prices and for them a large amount of cheap, poor grade, or even poisonous liquor is constantly produced and is in general circulation (p. 39).

Virginia has been a zealous prohibition State since 1914. Yet the number of arrests for drunkenness in Richmond has been growing steadily and has increased by more than one-third in five years. Also the testimony shows that the amount of liquor in circulation has grown steadily. Prices tell the same story. Kansas has had State prohibition for more than 50 years. It is significant that the death rate in Kansas from alcoholism and causes attributable to alcohol, which had fallen to a very low level between 1917 and 1920, has risen to the level of 1917 (pp. 40-41).

It is true that the chief centers of nonenforcement or ineffective enforcement are the cities. But since 1920 the United States has been preponderantly urban. A failure of enforcement in the cities is failure in the major part of the land in population and influence (p. 43).

There was much corruption in connection with the regulation of the liquor traffic before prohibition. But the present régime of corruption in connection with the liquor traffic is operating in a new and larger field, and is more extensive (p. 44).

Some advocates of the law have constantly urged and are still urging disregard or abrogation of the guarantees of liberty and of sanctity of the home which had been deemed fundamental in our policy (p. 46).

It is therefore a serious impairment of the legal order to have a national law upon the books theoretically governing the whole land and announcing a policy for the whole land which public opinion in many important centers will not enforce and in many others will not suffer to be enforced effectively (p. 49).

In consequence, many of the best citizens in every community, on whom we rely habitually for the upholding of law and order, are at most lukewarm as to the national prohibition act. Many who are normally law-abiding are led to an attitude hostile to the statute by a feeling that repression and interference with private conduct are carried too far. This feeling is reinforced when it is seen that the wealthy are generally able to obtain pure liquors, where those with less means may run the risk of poisoning. Moreover, searches of homes, especially under State laws, have necessarily seemed to bear more upon people of moderate means than upon those of wealth or influence (pp. 54-55).

Lawyers everywhere deplore, as one of the most serious effects, of prohibition, the change in the general attitude toward the Federal courts. Formerly, these tribunals were of exceptional dignity and commanded wholesome fear and respect. The professional criminal who sometimes had scanty respect for the State tribunals was careful so to conduct himself as not to come within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. The effect of the huge volume of liquor prosecutions, which has come to these courts under prohibition, has injured their dignity, impaired their efficiency, and endangered the wholesome respect for them which once obtained. Prosecutors, Federal and State, have been affected no less than courts. They have been appointed and elected too often under pressure of organizations concerned only with prohibition, as if nothing else were to be considered in the conduct of criminal justice (pp. 56-57).

It has been urged that there has been great improvement in domestic relations. But such few statistics as to divorce for drunkenness as are available and reasonably trustworthy seem to show a steady increase in divorce on that ground, after a sharp drop in the initial years of prohibition. So also as to the effect upon public health which has been urged by some writers. The steady development of means of conserving the public health, and the continual advance of medical science, preclude any just comparison of the statistical data available (pp. 72-73).

INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS

The eighteenth amendment is the first instance in our history in which the effort has been made by constitutional provision to extend the police control of the Federal Government to every individual and home in the United States.—Henry W. Anderson.

No less than eight States, containing one-fourth of the entire population of the United States, either have no enforcement law, or have repealed or voted to repeal such laws. The people of other States are obviously contemplating similar action. (Id.)

"The Congress shall have power to regulate or to prohibit the manufacture, traffic in or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, and the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes." This modification would bring the amendment into conformity with the traditional principles of our system of Government. (Id.)

In my opinion the eighteenth amendment should be repealed.—Newton D. Baker.

I am one of the members who favor an immediate attempt at change. As I still hope that Federal regulation of the liquor traffic may prove more effective than that of the States, I favor revision of the amendment rather than its repeal.—Ada L. Comstock.

I agree with the conclusion of the report that enforcement and observance of the law have never been and are not now adequate or satisfactory and do not warrant its continuance unless a change is probable within a reasonable time.—William I. Grubb.

I believe that prohibition under the eighteenth amendment is entitled to a further trial before a revision or repeal of the amendment is recommended. (Id.)

The saloon was the center of political activity, but I think the corruption was not so widespread and flagrant as it now is. The amounts involved were not so large. Corruption had not become

such an established art and racketeering was unknown. It has now developed to a high degree of efficiency.—William S. Kenyon.

If prohibition can not be enforced, I should favor a trial of the system proposed by Commissioner Anderson. (Id.)

Summarizing, my conclusion is that the eighteenth amendment can not be effectively enforced without the active general support of public opinion and the law-enforcement agencies of the States and cities of the Nation; that such support does not now exist; and that I can not find sufficient reason to believe that it can be obtained. I see no alternative but repeal of the amendment.—Monte M. Lemann.

I have come to the conclusion that effective national enforcement of the eighteenth amendment in its present form is unattainable, therefore, steps should be taken immediately to revise the amendment.—Frank J. Loesch.

Mr. Anderson has presented in his statement a plan for control under the proposed revision of the amendment which is the result of careful and scientific thought and seems to meet the necessities of the situation more adequately than any other that has been so far suggested.—Kenneth Mackintosh.

The plan developed by Mr. Anderson and presented in his statement seems to me to be the best, and if after further trial prohibition is not enforceable I should favor serious consideration of his system.—Paul J. McCormick.

While making enforcement as effective as we may, so long as the amendment as it is, remains the supreme law of the land, we should be at work to enable the fundamental difficulties to be reached. This, it seems clear, can only be done by a revision of the amendment. * * * Mr. Anderson has proposed a well-thought-out plan, based on study of systems of liquor control and their operation. His plan deserves careful consideration as the best and most complete which has been brought to our attention. This or some like plan for adapting national control to local conditions may well be the next forward step.—Roscoe Pound.

* * * I have been forced to conclude that a further trial should be made of the enforceability of the eighteenth amendment under the present organization, with the help of recommended improvements.—Chairman George W. Wickersham.

The nearest point of agreement reached by the commission was on the Anderson plan, and that the President peremptorily rejects. Some comment on this plan is offered on the editorial page.

AN UNACCEPTABLE AMENDMENT

The recommendation of the Wickersham commission which appeared to win a majority approval of the commission itself and has been most widely discussed was prepared by Henry W. Anderson. The text is printed on page 434 of this issue. The amendment would give Congress power to (1) continue the present system of absolute national prohibition, (2) remit the matter in whole or in part to the States, (3) adopt any system of effective control.

Any change from the present system would be an improvement. But, with all deference to Mr. Anderson, we suggest that his amendment does not destroy the root evil.

That evil, in our judgment, is Federal control.

It is all but generally admitted that Congress should never have been given the power inherent in the eighteenth amendment. But in Mr. Anderson's plan that power remains in its integrity. Under it Congress could authorize a system which, like the present, satisfies no one but bootleggers and fanatics, or a system which would satisfy the brewers, the distillers, and the politicians, but not men and women whose first interest is the preservation of sane, constitutional government. What system would prevail would be decided by a partisan-controlled Congress.

Could a better method of putting the problem of liquor control into partisan politics possibly be contrived?

Candidates would be assessed not for their ability or patriotism but on this ground only, "Do you favor a wide-open country or nation-wide prohibition?" Federal judges and other officials would be appointed on the same basis, only to be hampered or dismissed from office by the incoming wet or dry administration. We should have confusion worse confounded.

No amendment which predicates Federal control can be acceptable. The sole remedy for the fearful evils of prohibition is repeal of the amendment. In the meantime let appropriations for enforcement be pared to the bone.

ANNUAL REPORT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 266)

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the Public Buildings Commission for the calendar year 1930 be printed with illustrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the printing of the report of the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is it the purpose to have the report printed as a document?

Mr. SMOOT. It is always printed every year under the law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is to be printed as a document?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; as a document.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, at the time when I yielded, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], whose sincerity we all admit and admire, had just made perhaps the strongest and the most plausible argument in favor of the retention of the provision that could be made. I think the argument made by my colleague [Mr. Smoot] ought to obtain. I think we ought to strike out the entire provision, and then the Committee on Appropriations of the House, if it does its duty, and if not, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—and it will do its duty—will make further investigation, and will make such recommendations by way of a provision in the deficiency bill as will deal with this question for the next ensuing year.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I did not intend to put myself in the position of saying that we should not strike this provision out or have a vote on it. What I thought was that we should follow the proper course and perfect it as much as possible, and then take a vote on striking out, letting the Senate pass on the matter.

Mr. KING. I am not complaining of the position of my friend the Senator from Washington. For 10 years—and my colleague has corroborated my statement—we have had declarations that this Housing Corporation would wind up the business which was before it, and liquidate.

I referred a moment ago—and I do so again with some regret, because of the demise of our dear friend—to the statement made by the late Senator from Maine, Mr. Fernald, who had charge of this matter. I am not quite sure as to the functions which he performed, but he was the spokesman for this organization here upon the floor, and he stated that it ought to be wound up at the earliest possible moment, and promised his best offices to accomplish that result. But he encountered hostility, as everybody who deals with Federal organizations and Federal instrumentalities encounters the utmost hostility when an effort is made to abolish them.

If we create a Federal bureau, it is fastened upon the Government not only for our lives but for the life of the Republic. We do not seem to have sufficient courage to abolish these bureaus when once they have been created.

I think the suggestion of my colleague ought to prevail. We ought to strike out this provision. If we refuse to do that and leave it to the deficiency appropriation bill to deal with it, then we ought to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], and require that the Housing Corporation shall be liquidated within the next fiscal year. If in the meantime facts should be brought to the attention of Congress to warrant a modification of that provision, then it could easily be provided for by joint resolution or by some independent measure or upon an appropriation bill. But I do not agree with the statements made that this organization ought to be tolerated much longer and that we ought to appropriate the sum carried in the bill.

Mr. JONES. Let me suggest that we reject the Senate committee amendment to strike out this language and then strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, perfect the provision and then move to strike it all out?

Mr. JONES. Yes; act on the committee amendment and then move to strike it all out.

Mr. KING. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the committee amendment be agreed to.

Mr. KING. I surrender the floor to my friend from Washington to accomplish that worthy act of administering the coup de grâce to this provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. I now move that we strike out the whole provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not in order until the committee amendments passed over are acted upon.

Mr. KING. I want to give notice that if the motion to strike out should not prevail—

Mr. JONES. I think it will prevail. I am perfectly willing that it should.

Mr. KING. I was going to say I would move to cut down the amount appropriated.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if this provision is stricken out, who will collect all this money? It seems to me there ought to be some way to authorize somebody to collect the money.

Mr. SMOOT. The matter will be in conference and will be taken care of there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment passed over is on page 25, line 9, under the heading "Housing Corporation," to strike out "\$12,180" and insert "\$17,104."

Mr. KING. That relates to the same subject. I suggest that it be passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; let us disagree to it.

Mr. KING. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 9, "Housing Corporation," the committee proposes to strike out "\$19,930" and insert in lieu thereof "\$26,154."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. I now move to strike out the whole provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Utah moves to strike out the entire provision under the subhead "Housing Corporation," as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For officers, clerks, and other employees (not to exceed \$12,180 in the District of Columbia and \$3,900 in the field), and for contingent and miscellaneous expenses in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including blank books, maps, stationery, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, freight and express charges, communication service, travel expense, printing and binding not to exceed \$150, and all other miscellaneous items and expenses not included in the foregoing and necessary to collect and account for the receipts from the sale of properties and the receipts from the operation of unsold properties of the United States Housing Corporation, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, property commandeered by the United States through the Secretary of Labor, and to collect the amounts advanced to transportation facilities and others; for payment of special assessments and other utility, municipal, State, and county charges or assessments unpaid by purchasers, and which have been assessed against property in which the United States Housing Corporation has an interest, and to defray expenses incident to foreclosing mortgages, conducting sales under deeds of trust, or reacquiring title or possession of real property under default proceeding, including attorney fees, witness fees, court costs, charges, and other miscellaneous expenses; for the maintenance and repair of houses, buildings, and improvements which are unsold; in all, \$19,930: *Provided further*, That upon the approval of this act the directors of the United States Housing Corporation of New York and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania shall appoint the chief clerk or other officer of the Department of Labor to act as their president or as their immediate representative in charge of administrative work, such departmental officer to serve without compensation in addition to the salary of his official position, and the directors of these corporations shall in like

manner designate the disbursing clerk for the Department of Labor to act in a similar capacity for the corporations, and shall reduce the pay roll by not less than the annual rate of \$13,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 53, after line 2, insert a new proviso to read as follows:

Provided, however, That no money appropriated by this or any other act shall be available for payment of retired pay under the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928 (Public, 506, 70th Cong.), to any person who is receiving a salary from the United States which exceeds \$2,000 per annum.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a word or two in explanation. I was not here when the corresponding bill for appropriations for the Veterans' Bureau passed the Congress last year. This is the first chance I have had to call to the attention of the Senate what seems to be a very shocking and scandalous condition.

The Senate will remember that under the leadership or inspiration of the late Senator Tyson, of Tennessee, we passed a bill allowing emergency officers to be placed upon the retired list of the Army, in effect, and get retired pay at the rate of three-quarters of their active service pay if they were 30 per cent or more disabled as a result of their war-time experience. Various dismal prophesies were made by those of us who resisted that proposal at the time. Some of them have proven to be true; some of them, perhaps, have not.

I think that if we could look at the list of employees of the United States which was put in the Record on the House on the 30th day of last April, at page 6862 and many pages following, the Members of the Senate would be shocked to see how the act has worked out. Let me read to the Senate not the whole list, because that would take the rest of this day, but just the list of those employees of the United States Veterans' Bureau who had been retired on the theory that they were disabled and who to-day are drawing pay of \$5,000 or more as officials of the Veterans' Bureau itself. The very bureau that retired them and said that they were incapable of work is to-day hiring them at these high salaries.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, they are drawing full salary as if they were not at all incapacitated for work, and at the same time drawing three-fourths retirement pay because they are incapacitated for work?

Mr. REED. On the theory that they can not work at all. The Senator has put it exactly right.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The statement has been made that there is one officer who draws a salary from the Government of \$9,000 a year and is receiving retirement pay.

Mr. REED. That is true. I am sure the Senate will be shocked to get these facts. Let me first read some of those that were put into the Record last April.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has just informed me that the amount of the salary of the officer referred to is \$9,000 a year, while he draws retired pay in the amount of three-fourths of his active-service pay.

Mr. REED. The officer referred to is Mr. William Wolf Smith, who is general counsel of the Veterans' Bureau. He was a captain in the Quartermaster's Department for about two months during the World War, and served in this country only. He has been receiving and is to-day receiving \$9,000 a year from the Veterans' Bureau for his employment as general counsel.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask whether his salary is fixed by law or by regulation?

Mr. REED. By regulation. He is also at the present time receiving \$187.50 a month as retirement pay because of his disability, he having been found to be more than 30

per cent disabled by the emergency officers' rating board of the bureau because he has chronic bronchitis and an inguinal hernia. I mention the facts thus freely about a particular case because they were all put in the RECORD in the House yesterday by Mr. BLANTON, of Texas. I would not feel as free to mention them if they were not already in the RECORD.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Were the ailments just referred to traceable to the two months' service in Washington in the Quartermaster's Department?

Mr. REED. As to that of course I do not know, but theoretically they must have been in order to show that he was incapacitated by his war service. He must have been able to produce evidence to the satisfaction of those officials of the bureau who rated him and probably showed that he had bronchitis back in 1918.

Let me show the Senate the kind of people that put Mr. William Wolf Smith on that retirement status. I turn to the list and find for example, Dr. Bernard Anthony McDermott, medical member of the emergency officers' retirement rating board. Doctor McDermott as an employee of the Veterans' Bureau receives a salary of \$5,000 a year. He also has been pronounced to be unfit to work and put on the retirement list. Doctor McDermott is getting \$125 a month from a grateful Government because he is unable to work. Doctor McDermott puts Mr. Smith on the retired list and Mr. Smith approves Doctor McDermott going on the retired list. One gets an annual salary of \$9,000 and the other \$5,000, and the testimony is that these salaries were fixed without any regard whatsoever for the fact that the incumbents might or might not have been receiving retirement pay.

I am not giving isolated instances. This thing is a widely prevalent scandal, and I am only talking now only about the Veterans' Bureau. Let me read from the list of last April. Remember, please, Mr. President, that many names have been added to the list since last April. I am reading from page 6862 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 10, 1930, and I am picking out only those individuals who get pay of \$5,000 or more a year.

I find that Winthrop C. Adams, of the District of Columbia, whose position in the bureau is that of medical director, is receiving \$8,000 a year salary and at the same time is getting \$150 a month retirement pay for his supposed disability.

I find next that Mr. William James Blake, of Massachusetts, who is regional manager, is drawing a salary of \$5,600 a year and at the same time getting retirement pay of \$125 a month.

Dr. John Carling, of California, physician, is being paid by the Veterans' Bureau \$5,200 a year and getting \$150 a month retirement pay.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no desire to interfere with the plan the Senator has in mind, but let me ask a question about the doctors.

Mr. REED. I am not singling out doctors. The first man I mentioned was a lawyer.

Mr. COPELAND. To take up the doctor phase of the question first, is it not true that such a doctor as has been mentioned or the other doctors mentioned by the Senator might have been earning very much more money in private practice if they had not been disabled?

Mr. REED. That is possible, but the truth is that the first gentleman I mentioned never in his life earned as much as he has been receiving since he was taken into the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that true of all of the gentlemen named?

Mr. REED. I have no knowledge of that. I do not know whether they could earn more or not.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know about any one of them, but I can quite understand that a man by reason of injuries received in the service might be incapacitated for the larger practice that he might have had in medicine or law or engineering or something else, and who perhaps should be given some special consideration by reason of that fact.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In connection with the questions asked by the Senator from New York, I suggest to the Senator that he place in the RECORD, first, the total number of emergency officers who were eligible to receive the benefits of the emergency officer act; secondly, the total number of emergency officers who have received the benefits of the act; and, third, the number of physicians who have received the benefits of that law.

Mr. REED. I have not the figures at hand, but I will have them put in the RECORD to-morrow, and will be glad to do so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Approximately there were 125,000 emergency officers in the service during the war, something over 6,000 emergency officers have been given the benefit of the emergency officers' retirement law, and over 1,400 of the 6,000 are physicians.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Massachusetts will remember that General Tyson, who was active in securing the emergency officers' retirement legislation, indicated upon various occasions that the number who would apply was limited, and my recollection is—and I beg leave to correct it if I am in error—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think his estimate was that about 2,000 would apply.

Mr. REED. One thousand eight hundred was the number suggested.

Mr. KING. I was going to say between 1,500 and 1,800.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania before he concludes that he inform the Senate of the explanation given by the Veterans' Bureau for the liberality that apparently has been shown, and the large number placed on the retired list. I refer to a certain opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Suppose an ex-service man who is afflicted and is drawing compensation from the Government, afterwards secures a position in the Government, but still is not normal and continues to draw a certain amount of money from the Government, is it the Senator's contention that he should give that up entirely and accept the salary alone?

Mr. REED. No; the contention is this, that if he is so capable as to be able to earn \$2,000 a year or more from the Government in salary, then, while he is earning that salary he ought not to be drawing retirement pay; but if his position with the Government ceases, he should immediately go back to the retirement-pay status.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this colloquy has suggested another phase of the matter which I think should be mentioned, namely, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is worded so as to constitute a limit on the use of the appropriation.

Mr. REED. Yes; Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And it is, therefore, according to the rules, not subject to a point of order.

Mr. REED. I hope that is so, and that was in mind when the amendment was written.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is the impression I have from my recollection of the language of the amendment. If the amendment shall be agreed to, this situation

will arise: The officer will continue to serve and receive his salary from the Government and during that time he will receive no compensation under the emergency officers' retirement act, but his legal right to the retirement pay will continue until some change is made in the law which authorizes him to receive it. If we adopt this provision, in all probability the Congress will be flooded with claims to which there is no legal defense, and we will be passing private bills paying emergency officers what they are entitled to under the law which Congress has enacted but what we have refused to pay them by reason of a provision in an appropriation bill, notwithstanding the authorization to which I have referred.

I recognize the necessity for some provision to safeguard against the condition brought to our attention, but I am wondering if the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is conceded to be very familiar with all matters that pertain to military affairs, has given thought to that aspect of the matter?

Mr. REED. Yes, Mr. President; I should like to see the general law corrected at the same time, and we will take steps to do it; but it does not seem to me that we ought to continue this obvious unfairness throughout the period that would elapse before we can do that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I point out to the Senator that, while we can withhold the appropriation providing funds for the purpose of paying these emergency officers who have retired and have been allowed to benefit by the act referred to, they will still be entitled to it as a matter of law.

Mr. REED. Yes; until we change the law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; and they will also be entitled to insist that until the law is changed they shall have their compensation. So I am wondering whether we will be accomplishing very much by adopting this amendment.

Mr. REED. I think so, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Have I made myself clear to the Senator?

Mr. REED. Very clear, and the Senator's point is well taken.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, this is what I had in mind: An ex-service man may improve somewhat in health; he may have been wounded severely and his ability to work may have been impaired, but he may have such determination to work and to fight to get back his health that he succeeds in fitting himself to hold a position under the Government. I wish to know if in obtaining such a position he would have to give up the compensation he was drawing by reason of the disability brought about by injury received in line of service of his country? Furthermore, if his work became unsatisfactory and he should lose his position under the Government, would he be left adrift without any care and concern and support from the Government?

Mr. REED. Absolutely not, Mr. President; then he would immediately go back to his retired-pay status and be entitled to that pay.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the Senator's amendment simply forbids paying any money appropriated under this or any other act to those retired emergency officers who draw in excess of \$2,000 a year from the Government.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator thought of this phase of the matter: There may be a large number of emergency officers who are earning and receiving more than \$2,000 a year from private employers, who, nevertheless, will continue to receive their retirement pay under this act, and even under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. REED. That is true; but I think we ought to correct an evil that is right at our door before we try to reach out to the more remote and more difficult cases such as the Senator mentions. Doubtless there are such cases, many of them.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt there are such cases, and to single out those who are employed by the Government and say that their retirement pay shall cease, when we are not saying to the retired officer who is engaged in private enterprise that his retirement pay shall cease, seems somewhat unfair. It is doubtless true that there are many veterans of the World War drawing compensation who at the same time are earning some income.

Mr. REED. I am sure that is so, and I am glad that it is so.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and many of those veterans who are drawing compensation may be earning practically as much or what, on the face of it, would seem to be about as much, as their experience and capacity would lead one to expect they might earn if they were not suffering from any disability. It presents a rather difficult question. Let me submit to the Senator this thought: Congress itself provided for the retirement of these officers if they were 30 per cent disabled, and the Congress set up the machinery by which their degree of disability was to be determined. If, therefore, any officer who is not 30 per cent disabled is on the retired list and is drawing retired pay, the fault is primarily with the Congress and with the agency administering the law.

Mr. REED. I agree with the latter part of the Senator's statement; it is the fault of the agency administering the law.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. REED. That is the difference between these cases and the cases in civil life which the Senator mentions. These are the men who are enforcing the law; these men constitute the tribunal which appraises the disability of those who apply to be placed on the retired list.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment further, the way to correct the abuse is to disqualify any retired officer from sitting as a member of the retirement board, just as one is disqualified who has an interest or stake in any litigation. He has not any personal stake in the case being tried by him, but he is a member of that class who fall under the benefits of the law. The point is, it seems to me, that Congress has done something which has led to rather bad conditions. The Senator properly points them out. It is certain that there are many of these veteran officers in private life whose retirement pay would not be affected by this amendment, and it hardly seems the just thing to cut others of them off merely because they happen to be working for the Government.

Mr. REED. I think we had better reach the cases for which we are responsible and are right at our door.

But in order that the list may be complete, Mr. President, let me give the other cases which seem to me to be outstanding. I think the last one I gave was that of Doctor Carling. Then there is Dr. Wilfred Ernest Chambers, of Missouri, medical officer in charge, drawing pay from the Veterans' Bureau of \$6,500 a year and drawing \$206.25 a month in retired pay.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Has this issue any application to Regular Army officers who are retired?

Mr. REED. None whatever.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not mean has the amendment application to them; I mean are the conditions to which the Senator's amendment is addressed with respect to emergency retired officers analogous to those which sometimes prevail with respect to regular retired officers?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President, because the regular officer's retirement pay is an accumulated old-age insurance, which is part of the officer's contract of service, and does not depend upon his injury or disability, while in the case of emergency officers retired pay is expressly stated to be compensation for disability.

Then I come to Dr. Booton S. Compton, of Kentucky, clinical director, at a salary of \$5,800, and drawing \$125 a month retired pay; Eugene Davis, of Tennessee, medical officer in charge, drawing \$6,500 and receiving \$187.50 a month retire-

ment pay; Dr. William T. Doherty, of Kansas, physician, drawing \$5,007 a year salary and \$125 a month retired pay.

Dr. James W. Donnelly—

The Senate will notice these are all doctors; and if one will look over the list of disabilities for which they are retired it is astonishing to find that a lot of kidney trouble, stomach trouble and chronic bronchitis, and all that, were suffered by these gentlemen, who never saw France during the World War, but served here and enjoyed just as good housing conditions, just as good climatic conditions, and just as good food as they ever had in civil life. They are able, however, to show to the satisfaction of their companions in charge of the administration of the emergency officers retirement act that their Bright's disease or other disability came from their army service.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator from Arkansas referred to the Regular Army officers who are retired. I may be mistaken, but, as I recall, when the Committee on the District of Columbia was considering the nomination of General Patrick, who was on the retired list as a Regular Army officer, the point was raised, and the only question which we determined in respect to that matter was that the general law disqualifying a retired Regular Army officer did not apply to an officer appointed for the District of Columbia. So I assume that a Regular Army officer under retirement can not get the benefit of his retirement if he is employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. REED. I am not certain about that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That was the question I desired to ask, although perhaps it was not made as clear as it should have been.

Mr. REED. There have been some special acts passed in regard to that, allowing a duplication of the two sources of income. Generally speaking, no person can draw two kinds of salary from the United States.

Mr. BLAINE. If the Senator will permit me, I am quite certain that the committee investigated that matter very carefully; and the only reason why they found that the disqualification did not attach to General Patrick was that he was not appointed as an officer of the United States but as an officer of the District of Columbia, and therefore was qualified.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I ask for information.

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. Was not the question with respect to General Patrick raised not because of retirement for physical disability but because of retirement for age?

Mr. BLAINE. He was retired under the general retirement system for Regular Army officers.

Mr. KING. Because of age or longevity of service?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes. He had reached the age of retirement and was drawing retirement compensation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question? Is it the Senator's understanding that a Federal statute prevents a Regular Army officer who is retired from receiving his retired pay while drawing from the Government a salary above a stated amount—\$2,000?

Mr. REED. From the Government; not in civil life.

Mr. BLAINE. Not in civil life.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That was the question I asked. The Senator's amendment has no relationship to employment in civil life.

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And it has no relationship to employment in State or municipal governments.

Mr. REED. No; that is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wonder if the Senator gave consideration to making his amendment extend to that.

Mr. REED. Perhaps it may be wise in the future; but I am thinking particularly of the Veterans' Bureau itself. This amendment would not even apply to men working here in the District of Columbia outside the Government service;

but I think we ought to straighten up the conditions in the Veterans' Bureau first, and then we can look about us further.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Proceeding on the theory that those who are enjoying these somewhat exceptional benefits have been, in a measure, the judges in their own cases?

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the decision has been rendered that the amount of money drawn by each of the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned here, together with what they were drawing as salary, did not come under the prohibition against paying two salaries amounting to more than \$2,000 per year to any employee.

Mr. REED. That may be the technical decision; but certainly the spirit of the law is clearly violated.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I was wondering.

Mr. REED. Let me run down and give the balance of these cases, because so far I have only mentioned a few; and I do not want to give the Senate or the country the impression that there are only that few.

Next, Dr. James W. Donnelly, District of Columbia, medical supervisor; salary, \$5,600 a year; retired pay, \$125 a month.

Mr. Frank Thomas Duffy, of Illinois; regional manager. Since the bureau is decentralized the men of all that district go to him; and, in effect, he is the final judge of all the cases that are not very closely contested. He is regional manager, receiving \$5,600 a year from the Veterans' Bureau and \$125 a month retirement pay.

Dr. Miles Jordan Duncan, of California, physician; \$5,007 a year plus \$150 a month retirement pay.

Dr. Jo. Marvin Ferguson, of Arkansas, medical officer in charge; salary, \$6,500 a year; retirement pay, \$150 a month.

Dr. Thomas Foster, District of Columbia, consultant to council on appeals; salary, \$5,200 and retirement pay of \$150 a month.

I wonder how this would sound to some poor enlisted man who is getting perhaps \$40 or \$50 and has no job and can not find a job:

Dr. Claude C. Keeler, of Minnesota, is a physician and is getting \$5,200 a year from the Veterans' Bureau and he is getting retirement pay of \$150 a month.

Dr. Ignatz D. Loewy, of Arizona, is clinical director; is paid \$6,000 a year and gets \$206.25 a month retirement pay.

Here is one: Dr. Bernard Anthony McDermott, District of Columbia, medical member, Emergency Officers' Retirement Rating Board; salary from the Veterans' Bureau, \$5,000 a year; retirement pay, \$125 a month. How is he to defend the interests of the United States in these borderline cases where his fellow physicians come in and claim that their particular type of liver trouble dates from about 1918? What position is he in to say, "No; you can not prove that the war caused your disability"?

Then we have Dr. Clayton A. Patterson, of California, regional dental officer, who is drawing \$5,157 a year in salary—not a bad income for an able-bodied dentist—and getting \$165 a month in addition in retirement pay.

Dr. Carlin Philips, of New York, medical member, is getting \$5,307 a year, and he is drawing \$187.50 retirement pay every month.

Dr. Richard A. Roach, of California, physician, \$5,007 annual salary; monthly retirement pay, \$150.

Dr. Frank R. Sedgley, of Minnesota, chief of the surgical service, \$5,600 a year salary; \$150 a month retirement pay.

George Coleman Skinner, District of Columbia, chief of division, salary, \$6,500 a year; monthly retirement pay, \$150.

Dallas Barton Smith, of Alabama, director's representative—Director Hines's representative down there—getting \$6,500 a year, and \$262.50 a month retirement pay.

Dr. Robert P. Smith, of Montana, physician, \$5,000 salary; \$187.50 retirement pay.

Dr. Howard C. Von Dahn, of Florida, medical officer in charge of United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital. He must have some ability to work if he can be in charge of a

whole hospital. His annual pay is \$6,500 a year, and his monthly retirement pay is \$150.

Dr. Justus M. Wheate, of California, physician, \$5,200 a year pay; \$240.62 a month retirement pay on top of that.

Dr. Herbert E. Whitley, of Kentucky—notice how few of these men are anything but doctors. Not many machine-gun bullets or shell wounds are responsible for these retirements.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question which his statement just made provokes?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the list from which the Senator is reading purport to embrace all of the retired emergency officers who are in the same status with respect to receiving Government salaries as those to whom he has referred?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; I am giving only about 10 per cent of them. I am picking out only those whose salaries are \$5,000 or more. The complete list fills two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has not understood me. Does that list embrace all who are within the same class with respect to Federal salaries? In other words, in addition to the doctors whose names the Senator is giving, are there a number of other persons of different professions or of no profession who are receiving over \$5,000 a year from the Government and at the same time drawing the emergency officers' retired pay?

Mr. REED. This list gives only employees of the Veterans' Bureau itself.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does it give all of the employees of the Veterans' Bureau who are in that category?

Mr. REED. Yes, Mr. President; but it so happens that only two or three of them who are not doctors get over \$5,000. The men who get the biggest salaries are in almost all cases physicians or dentists.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, can the Senator give the total number of persons drawing retirement pay from the Veterans' Bureau who are actually employed in the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; I can not. There are approximately two full pages of 6-point type in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving the list as of last April; but a good many have been put on since. Among them is the general counsel, Mr. William Wolff Smith, whose pay is \$9,000 and who is drawing \$187 a month retirement pay. He is not in the list from which I am reading. He has been put on since that list was compiled.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is the list which the Senator is reading the list of all the employees of the Veterans' Bureau who are getting retirement pay or only of those who receive pay over \$5,000 a year?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; it is all employees of the Veterans' Bureau as of last April. I am only reading those receiving over \$5,000 just to save time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There are probably several hundred employees of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; several hundred. There are a good many whose pay is less than \$2,000, and, of course, the amendment would not affect them.

I think I have now given all except Doctor Whitley, of Kentucky, medical officer in charge; salary, \$6,500; retirement pay, \$150 a month.

Mr. President, I have not the list here, but it was put in the RECORD at the time the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill was under consideration; and it shows that not 5 per cent of the persons in the list from which I have been reading owe their disability to any act of the enemy. It is only by a great stretch of the imagination that most of these diseases can be associated with their war service. It seems to me that where these men are intrusted with protecting the United States against fraudulent claims—and inevitably there are such claims—they themselves ought not to be in the class which has received the advantage of the most liberal construction of a most liberal law that was never intended for persons in their circumstances.

For that reason, I think the amendment is justified.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Was not 30 per cent fixed as the amount of disability necessary for retirement in the Regular Army upon the theory that 30 per cent disability unfits a man to be a medical officer in charge of a hospital, unfits a man to be an emergency officer in charge of other men, unfits him to be a quartermaster officer in charge of the accounts of business of the Government?

Mr. REED. Precisely.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The whole theory of fixing at 30 per cent the disability necessary for retirement is that that is the line of demarcation between fitness and unfitness to carry on.

Mr. REED. Precisely; and the very fact that they can carry on, that they can swing these big salaries, is proof positive to my mind that the diagnosis of their degree of disability has been too liberal.

Mr. President, in what I have said I have meant no reflection upon these individuals. They are doing the ordinary, natural, human thing of taking what they can get. Probably most of us in their circumstances would have done the same thing. I am not finding fault with them, but with the system which we ourselves have instituted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to make points of order to amendments offered to appropriation bills which are subject to points of order. That is a general rule of the committee. I believe this amendment is subject to a point of order. It refers not alone to this measure but to all other similar measures, and I think that would make it subject to a point of order, but it is a common saying that there are exceptions to all rules, and I think that under some circumstances I am justified in not following the direction of the committee. I think this is one of those cases. I believe the conditions shown here are such that this amendment on this bill is justified. It is a peculiar situation, an unusual condition, which the amendment is sought to meet. So I am not going to make a point of order against the amendment myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that it is in the nature of a limitation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but, Mr. President, it applies not alone to this measure but to all others. I hope the President pro tempore will not pass on it, because it is not necessary for him to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not passing on it; he is intimating what he would do.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who are interested in the question of the right of Regular Army officers to receive retirement pay, I find in a brief filed with the Committee on the District of Columbia a statement I want to quote. I also want to quote the statute, which will clear up the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas. I quote from the brief as follows:

The Attorney General by his opinions construed the retired pay of an officer as compensation. No differentiation was made between retired pay and pension in the Tyler, Gillmore, or De Gress cases hereinbefore cited; but had the courts gone further and made the distinction, the decisions would have undoubtedly been otherwise.

Then there is this:

However, these restrictive laws have been changed by the statute of 1894, as follows:

"No person who holds an office, the salary or annual compensation attached to which amounts to the sum of \$2,500, shall be appointed to or hold any other office to which compensation is attached unless specially heretofore or hereafter specially authorized thereto by law; but this shall not apply to retired officers of the Army or Navy whenever they may be elected to public office or whenever the President shall appoint them to office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

That is from section 2, Twenty-eighth United States Statutes, page 174.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the limitation as to Regular Army officers seems to be \$2,500 instead of \$2,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not quarrel at all with the purpose the Senator from Pennsylvania has in mind, but I am convinced this is the wrong way of getting at it. It is conceivable, of course, that in the course of human events some disabled veteran might be elected to this body, a disabled emergency officer, and drawing retirement pay.

It is not only conceivable but it is true as a matter of fact, that many of the veterans who are receiving compensation are earning considerable sums of money. It is true, as a matter of fact, that many of the veterans who are receiving compensation from the Government for some degree of disability are actually employed by the Veterans' Bureau here in Washington and throughout the States. In fact, it is a part of the policy of Congress to employ veterans and give them preferences in all positions. That is one of the policies established by the Congress of the United States. It is a public policy recognized, of course, by the President of the United States. On the one hand we insist on the Veterans' Bureau and all other agencies of the Government giving to all disabled veterans, whether emergency officers or disabled privates—that is, disabled men who hold no office in the Army—the preference in every department of the Government. We have civil-service rules which give them preference. We have civil-service rules which give them double preference for disability. Yet we have not seen fit to provide that no soldier or officer shall receive compensation or retirement benefits under any of our laws when he is upon the Government pay roll, and that seems to me to be the only practicable and feasible way of dealing with this problem. If we are going to say that when his salary exceeds a certain amount he shall then be denied the benefits of any particular act of Congress, it seems to me we are getting ourselves into a great deal of difficulty.

While 30 per cent permanent disability may be such a handicap as to make one so afflicted practically incapable of earning money as an ordinary proposition, that degree of disability does not incapacitate professional men. It is utterly impossible to say whether these retired officers who happen also to be doctors would now be available at the salary paid by the Government if they were not handicapped by a disability, and felt, therefore, that they could not earn in private life what they otherwise might be expected to earn.

I do not see how we can hold to the policy of preferring service men who are disabled, how we can insist upon every branch of the Government giving preference to service men, and at the same time saying to those service men, "If you earn a salary from the Government in excess of \$2,000, you shall not receive the benefit provided under the officers' retirement act."

It seems to me that the fault is in the law passed by the Congress, and in the administration of the law by the machinery set up by the Congress, and as long as we are going to have this law, and permit a disabled emergency officer in private life to earn whatever he may, and yet not deny him the benefits under the retirement act, we ought also to allow those who accept employment at the hands of the Government the same privilege.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. Let me finish my sentence, and then I will yield. I agree that there is a condition here most undesirable, but I do not think this is the way to remedy that particular defect in the law and in the administration of the law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the salaries which were established, and which these persons are receiving, as well as others who have not suffered disabilities, were established upon the theory that the persons who were called to fill these various positions were men entirely sound of body and sound of mind, and suffering no disability whatever. Now we are simply saying, "You are getting compensation because of

disability. That will be taken into account in determining the amount which you shall receive." It seems to me that is entirely just and proper. Moreover, the Senator concedes that the situation now is unsatisfactory, using his expression. We can not eat the cherry all at once. We can take a bite at the cherry. We could not deal now with the entire subject, but having initiated this legislation, it will be very proper to pursue the matter further, and deal with those in other activities.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see how we are going to do it ever. The Senator from Utah is quite wrong in his essential premise, that is, that we fix these scales of salaries upon the assumption that a man accepting the work is perfectly sound in body and mind. That can not be true, when we come along in the next breath and say that the disabled ex-service man shall be given a 10 per cent preference when a job is to be filled.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean that when the salaries were fixed, say, at nine or ten thousand dollars for the lawyer—and that is the salary given to lawyers in the highest positions in the Government—and six or seven or eight thousand dollars for doctors, it was intended that no one should serve as a lawyer or doctor, or fill those positions, except a man who was a disabled veteran?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; I did not say that at all.

Mr. KING. Then it postulates the view that those who were selected were competent to fill the positions.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly it does. They must be competent.

Mr. KING. And to be entirely competent, they must be physically and mentally strong and sound, and not disabled.

Mr. GEORGE. Then what becomes of the public policy which the Senator has insisted on writing into the law, that the disabled ex-service man must be given a preference?

Mr. President, in fixing public salaries, it has never been the theory, at least the theory upon which we have acted, that the salaries should be fixed at a point which will enrich men, which will induce men to come into the public service for the purpose of acquiring private fortunes. We have always fixed them with reference to the actual necessities of men who were capable of discharging the particular duties.

We can not hold to both theories. We can not say to the Veterans' Bureau, "You must give preference to the disabled veterans," and at the same time say this is the proper way to deal with an admitted evil, by taking away the benefit to the disabled veteran simply and solely because the salary which we have fixed is in excess of some amount which we now believe he should not receive, and at the same time claim the benefits under the act.

I am quite free to admit the evil at which this amendment is aimed, but it does seem to me that this is not the just way or the proper way to reach it, because it would put the burden upon those professional classes, which, in all probability, on an average, at least, would have been able to earn the Government salary plus the retirement benefit given under the law passed by Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, have all the committee amendments been acted on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the amendments of which the Chair has any information have been disposed of.

Mr. KING. I invite attention to page 17, where there is carried a hundred million dollar appropriation for the Federal Farm Board, and to page 19, where there is an appropriation of \$1,900,000 for the compensation of the members of the board. I know that any criticism of these appropriations will not change the terms of the bill. There is a feeling that we have committed ourselves to the expenditure of \$500,000,000 in this experiment which I do not think anybody will claim is a "noble experiment."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The \$100,000,000 is the last of the \$500,000,000. The Senator will recall that we appropriated \$150,000,000 just before Christmas. The board came back later with this application for the last \$100,000,000 authorized and it has been allowed. When the item was passed upon in the committee I examined Mr. Legge at length. Mr. Legge does not think very much of the appropriation for the Farm Board, apparently, from what he said, and as everybody knows it has been a fiasco that has done the farmers no good. I know it has done the cotton farmers of the South no good, but probably has done them a great deal of harm. It will be noted that in his testimony Mr. Legge does not seriously controvert that view. I want to invite the attention of the Senator to that testimony. In it he promised there would be no more calls for money. Of course, the only way calls for money can now be answered is to pass an amendment to the act authorizing additional appropriations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I inquire of both Senators if it would not be a good idea now to recess now and continue consideration of the amendment to-morrow?

Mr. KING. I think so, because I am going to move to strike out the item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the attention of the Senator to the testimony to which I have referred.

Mr. KING. I do not think we can finish this matter to-night. I am going to discuss it somewhat at length.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah offer an amendment?

Mr. KING. I have not yet done so, but I contemplate doing so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I was very much in hopes that we might get the pending appropriation bill through to-day. I have another appropriation bill which I want to call up immediately following the disposition of the one now before us. I thought that we ought to continue until half-past 5 anyway. It is only 5 o'clock now.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Senator can get through with the bill to-night. On the other hand, I believe that by recessing now until to-morrow at such hour as suits the Senator we may be able to compress the matter.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that that will shorten consideration of the measure?

Mr. KING. I think so.

Mr. JONES. I have a great deal of confidence in the assurances of the Senator, especially along that line.

Mr. KING. Many of the appropriation bills which ought to have been debated and considered at length have not been. Here is a bill appropriating \$1,000,000,000 or more and we have given no consideration to it at all. I think the Senate has been derelict in challenging attention to some of the appropriations that are being made.

Mr. JONES. All of the appropriation bills have been gone into very carefully in the committee.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I have read not only hundreds but almost thousands of pages of hearings held in the House, and nearly all of the Senate hearings, and I disagree with my friend. I do not think the appropriation bills have been carefully considered. Representatives of the department come before the committee and tender an item calling for \$100,000. It is read and a few questions are asked. "What is the next item? What is the next item?" One can read the hearings almost in vain relating to the various items, feeling that many of them are not entirely justified.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that upon the assurance of the junior Senator from Utah that if we quit now we will shorten con-

sideration of the bill to-morrow, I shall be glad to comply and am willing to suspend for the day.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. HARRIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no messages from the President of the United States, reports of committees are in order. [After a pause.] There being no reports of committees, the calendar is in order. The clerk will state the first business on the calendar.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk announced the nomination of David Burnet, of Ohio, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, action on this nomination has been held up at my request for quite a while now. I was expecting some information which I wanted to submit to the Senate. I think the Senate has waited as long as I have reason to expect. I have not received the information promised me in regard to it, and so far as I am concerned I make no further objection to the consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BLAINE subsequently said: Mr. President, what was the order with reference to the nomination of David Burnet, of Ohio, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BLAINE. No other order was made with reference to it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. None. The present occupant of the chair no longer asks if the President may be notified.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Just what is the status, then, of an appointee when the Senate confirms him and the President is not notified?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It waits until the statutory time for a reconsideration has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Until two other executive session days have passed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two executive session days must intervene before a commission can issue.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk announced the nomination of Stanley M. Ryan to be United States district attorney, western district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk announced the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Colorado if the nomination for postmaster at Boston is contained in the list?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; the nomination of William E. Hurley is on the list.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I concur in the request of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all postmaster nominations on the calendar are confirmed en bloc.

ALBERT M. SAMES

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am informed that the Judiciary Committee to-day made a favorable report on the appointment of Albert M. Sames, of Arizona, to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona. I address my inquiry to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. There was such a report made, but it could not be made in time to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. I had it in mind to suggest, if there is no objection, that I would ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the nomination at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I doubt whether we ought to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska maintain his objection?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not understand the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will withdraw his request unless there is some special reason for it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it ought to go to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will go to the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 6, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 26), 1931

SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lieut. Daniel Jerome Martin, Infantry (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from February 14, 1930.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Alfred James Booth, Adjutant General's Department, from February 1, 1931.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Clark Porter Chandler, Cavalry from February 1, 1931.

Maj. John Walton Lang, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Maj. Henry Harley Arnold, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

To be majors

Capt. Thomas Courtenay Locke, Quartermaster Corps, from February 1, 1931.

Capt. George Aloysius Corbin, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Capt. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Field Artillery, from February 1, 1931.

Capt. Howard Noah Scales, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Capt. William Arthur McAdam, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

To be captains

First Lieut. Leland Wilbur Miller, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Raphael Baez, jr., Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Robert Halbert Finley, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieutenant Don Lee Hutchins, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Clarence Herbert Welch, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Ennis Clement Whitehead, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Joseph Lawrence Erickson, Quartermaster Corps, from February 1, 1931.

First Lieut. Alfred Jefferson Lyon, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Joseph Cyril Augustin Denniston, Air Corps, from January 28, 1931.

Second Lieut. John Franklin Bird, Field Artillery, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Henry Beane Margeson, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Claude Franklin Burbach, Field Artillery, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Raymond Miller Barton, Cavalry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. William Lloyd Burbank, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Donald Hudson Bratton, Cavalry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Wallace Hallock Honnold, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Emmor Graham Martin, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Walter Scott Strange, Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. Welborn Barton Griffith, jr., Infantry, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. John Halliday McCormick, Air Corps, from February 1, 1931.

Second Lieut. William Nelson Gillmore, Field Artillery, from February 1, 1931.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Frederick Hultman Foucar, Medical Corps, from February 3, 1931.

Maj. Paul White Gibson, Medical Corps, from February 4, 1931.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 26), 1931

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

David Burnet to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Stanley M. Ryan to be United States attorney, western district of Wisconsin.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur V. Cashion, Eudora.

Arch B. Smith, Osceola.

Omer B. Ewing, Scranton.

CONNECTICUT

Burton Hodge, Roxbury.

HAWAII

William I. Wells, Haiku.

Kenichi Masunaga, Kealia.

Alexander Moir, Papaikou.

IDAHO

Willis M. Sears, Albion.
George F. McMartin, Coeur d'Alene.

IOWA

Kate R. Weston, Webster City.

KANSAS

Isaac A. Robertson, Alma.
Jesse M. Foster, Clifton.
Edward R. Dannefer, Cuba.
Albert J. Deane, Fowler.
Melvin F. Gardner, Greenleaf.
James G. Frazer, Halstead.
Abe K. Stouffer, Liberal.
Alta A. McCutcheon, Little River.
Raymond R. Norris, Marquette.
Louis T. Miller, Ness City.
Charles N. Wooddell, Nickerson.
Luella Tapley, Quenemo.
George S. Robb, Salina.

KENTUCKY

James A. Leach, Beaver Dam.
Thomas D. Jones, Clinton.
Jewell S. Webb, Earlington.
Samuel W. Crump, Glasgow Junction.
Carl B. Marshall, Lewisburg.
Newell R. Downing, Mays Lick.
Lottie P. Thompson, Sadieville.
Raymond B. Dycus, Smithland.

MAINE

John A. Babb, Dixfield.

MASSACHUSETTS

William E. Hurley, Boston.
George F. Wason, Hingham.
Edmund Spencer, Lenox.

MICHIGAN

Elmer R. Fate, Bellaire.
Orin T. Mallory, Blissfield.
Gladys E. Gaskill, Delton.
Sarah E. Beardsley, Garden.
Charles B. Curtis, Houghton Lake.

NEBRASKA

Edward H. Springer, Brady.
William A. Gibson, Cedar Rapids.
James M. Fox, Gretna.
Hiram B. Cameron, Herman.
Harry A. Riley, Spalding.

NEW MEXICO

Agustin F. Sisneros, Espanola.
Pearl B. Grady, Texico.

NEW YORK

Roof D. Miller, Fort Plain.
William D. Shepard, Geneseo.
Carroll F. Simpson, Phoenicia.
Earl P. Milks, Scio.
Henry E. Johnston, Spencer.
Brainard W. Russell, Windsor.

OHIO

Henry W. Gruver, Miamisburg.

TENNESSEE

Charles H. Bewley, Greeneville.

TEXAS

Emma B. Green, Bowie.
Gertrude M. McCraney, Santa Rosa.
Frank A. King, Whitewright.

UTAH

Annie Palmer, Farmington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, we are still blest with the endless melody of divine mercy, which is forever chanted in the morning land of the heavenly world. Thy good angels still brood above us and tearful eyes are made tearless, clouds of gray are dissolved into radiant blue, and weary hearts find rest. How we praise Thee for this crowning wonder of divine love! The hills are Thine and the strength of the mountains are Thine. Thou dost hold the cup of the majestic sea in which it rages and roars, and yet day and night we nestle in the hollow of Thy hand. Marvelous are Thy works, O Lord! We thank Thee for the everlasting foundation on which we may repose in this rushing, restless world. Do Thou set our souls to-day in a soil enriched by the flowing tides of the river of life that we may bear fruit in every good work. In the holy name of our Saviour we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On January 26, 1931:

H. R. 10621. An act authorizing W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of McGregor, Iowa.

On January 27, 1931:

H. R. 15138. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission and the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Fulton, Miss.

On January 29, 1931:

H. R. 1075. An act to correct the naval record of James M. Hudson;

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Henry Manske, jr.;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of W. F. Nash;

H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of David A. Dehart;

H. R. 4159. An act for the relief of Harry P. Lewis;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of Guy Braddock Scott;

H. R. 4907. An act for the relief of Thomas Wallace;

H. R. 6453. An act for the relief of Peder Anderson;

H. R. 8117. An act for the relief of Robert Hofman;

H. R. 8665. An act for the relief of William A. Quigley;

H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Sterrit Keefe; and

H. R. 11297. An act for the relief of Arthur Edward Blanchard.

On January 30, 1931:

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution authorizing acceptance of a donation of land, buildings, and other improvements in Caddo Parish, near Shreveport, La.

On January 31, 1931:

H. R. 233. An act to approve the action of the War Department in rendering relief to sufferers of the Mississippi River flood in 1927;

H. R. 516. An act for the relief of John Jakes;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Martin G. Schenck, alias Martin G. Schanck;

H. R. 2266. An act for the relief of E. O. McGillis;

H. R. 3122. An act for the relief of William J. Frost;

H. R. 3692. An act for the relief of George Press;

H. R. 4501. An act to authorize funds for the construction of a building at Fort Sam Houston;

H. R. 5271. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land and erect a monument at the site near Crookston, in Polk County, Minn., to commemorate the sign-

ing of a treaty on October 2, 1863, between the United States of America and the Chippewa Indians;

H. R. 5661. An act authorizing the Sycamore Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Flishers Ferry, Ind.;

H. R. 6618. An act to provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the battlefield at Chalmette, La.;

H. R. 7302. An act for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney;

H. R. 7063. An act for the relief of H. E. Mills;

H. R. 7119. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Florida at or in the vicinity of Lake Worth Inlet;

H. R. 8649. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to collect an increased charge for return receipts for domestic registered and insured mail when such receipts are requested after the mailing of the articles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8806. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose fines on steamship and aircraft carriers transporting the mails beyond the borders of the United States for unreasonable and unnecessary delays and for other delinquencies;

H. R. 9779. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Mokelumne River, Calif., and its tributaries, with a view to the control of floods;

H. R. 10782. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service;

H. R. 11212. An act to authorize a pension to James C. Burke;

H. R. 11230. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Yellow Creek and other tributaries of the Cumberland River in and about the city of Middlesboro, Ky., with a view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11443. An act to provide for an Indian village at Elko, Nev.;

H. R. 11779. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pecatonica River northwest of Rockford, Ill., in section 5, township 27 north, range 11 east, fourth principal meridian;

H. R. 12121. An act to provide for a survey of the Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

H. R. 12404. An act to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide for national-park approaches;

H. R. 13132. An act authorizing the appropriation of Osage funds for attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation;

H. R. 13516. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Hudson River, between the cities of Albany and Rensselaer, N. Y.;

H. R. 13517. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, N. Y.;

H. R. 13532. An act to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Rio Grande at or near San Benito, Tex.;

H. R. 13533. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 14051. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Elk River on the Fayetteville-Winchester Road near the town of Kelso, in Lincoln County, Tenn.;

H. R. 14266. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the entertainment committee of the United Confederate Veterans 250 pyramidal tents, complete; fifteen 16 by 80 by 40 foot assembly tents; thirty 11 by 50 by 15 foot hospital-ward tents; 10,000 blankets, olive drab, No. 4; 5,000 pillowcases; 5,000 canvas cots; 5,000 cotton pillows; 5,000 bed sacks; 10,000 bed sheets; 20 field ranges, No. 1; 10 field bake ovens; 50 water bags (for ice water); to be used

at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Montgomery, Ala., in June, 1931;

H. R. 14276. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Dayton-Decatur Road between Rhea and Meigs Counties, Tenn.;

H. R. 14573. An act authorizing the attendance of the Army Band at the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Montgomery, Ala.;

H. R. 14679. An act authorizing Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, at or near Grassy Point, in Santa Rosa County, Fla.;

H. R. 14681. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Kankakee River;

H. R. 14916. An act for the relief of the Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 15008. An act to extend the south and east boundaries of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, relating to the Monongahela River, Pa.

On February 2, 1931:

H. R. 7998. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928.

On February 3, 1931:

H. R. 3313. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire, free of cost to the United States, the tract of land known as Confederate Stockade Cemetery, situated on Johnstons Island, Sandusky Bay, Ohio, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5904. An act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15256, the agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15256, the agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SANDLIN.

COMPILATION IN DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREA, ARKANSAS

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD information which I think will be of value to the Members of the House, contained in a report of the counties in the State of Arkansas and the population, together with the percentage of those assisted by the Red Cross.

I stated upon the floor of the House last Saturday that by February 10 there would be 500,000 people in Arkansas to

whom aid would be given regularly by the Red Cross. The Red Cross report which was given out the night I delivered that address showed that on February 1 there were over 500,000 being administered to by the Red Cross. The following chart was given out by the Red Cross and published in the Arkansas Gazette of the issue of February 1. This chart shows the population of each county and the number of persons in each receiving aid from the Red Cross. I insert this in order that the membership of this House may be in possession of the most recent and reliable figures to be had upon this question.

Number receiving Red Cross aid in Arkansas

County	County population	Number individuals assisted daily
Arkansas.....	22,300	3,677
Ashley.....	25,151	15,682
Baxter.....	9,519	1,575
Benton.....	35,253	167
Boone.....	14,937	747
Bradley.....	17,494	3,825
Calhoun.....	9,752	383
Carroll.....	15,820	122
Chicot.....	22,646	21,912
Clark.....	24,932	7,650
Clay.....	27,278	5,301
Cleburne.....	11,373	3,024
Cleveland.....	12,744	7,079
Columbia.....	27,320	7,794
Conway.....	21,949	9,113
Craighead.....	44,740	8,325
Crawford.....	22,549	3,767
Crittenden.....	39,717	16,421
Cross.....	25,723	13,505
Dallas.....	14,671	3,075
Desha.....	21,814	15,647
Drew.....	19,928	7,812
Faulkner.....	28,381	6,399
Franklin.....	15,762	1,598
Fulton.....	10,834	1,467
Garland.....	36,931	1,422
Grant.....	9,834	1,698
Greene.....	26,127	2,425
Hempstead.....	30,847	5,625
Hot Spring.....	18,105	4,500
Howard.....	17,489	4,419
Independence.....	24,225	4,140
Izard.....	12,872	2,592
Jackson.....	27,943	11,670
Jefferson.....	64,154	27,150
Johnson.....	19,289	113
Lafayette.....	16,934	4,374
Lawrence.....	21,663	9,972
Lee.....	26,637	22,410
Lincoln.....	20,250	12,798
Little River.....	15,515	6,705
Logan.....	24,110	4,829
Lonoke.....	33,759	18,113
Madison.....	13,334	14
Marion.....	8,876	657
Miller.....	30,586	19,125
Mississippi.....	69,289	25,763
Monroe.....	20,651	12,393
Montgomery.....	10,768	3,029
Nevada.....	20,407	3,740
Newton.....	10,564	284
Ouachita.....	29,890	2,929
Perry.....	7,695	1,742
Phillips.....	40,683	28,701
Pike.....	11,792	1,467
Poinsett.....	29,695	13,698
Polk.....	14,557	855
Pope.....	26,547	7,875
Prairie.....	15,187	3,564
Pulaski.....	137,727	9,000
Randolph.....	16,871	4,950
St. Francis.....	33,394	24,282
Saline.....	15,660	1,125
Scott.....	11,803	2,700
Searcy.....	11,056	810
Sebastian.....	54,426	1,431
Sevier.....	16,364	3,317
Sharp.....	10,765	69
Stone.....	7,993	806
Union.....	55,800	10,125
Van Buren.....	11,962	2,890
Washington.....	39,255	1,215
White.....	38,269	1,485
Woodruff.....	22,682	9,729
Yell.....	21,313	10,224
Total.....	1,854,482	519,516

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, there was an initial appropriation of \$3,000,000 put on this bill in another body which is a part of the \$20,000,000 naval construction program. What became of that \$3,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. WOOD. The Senate receded on that item.

Mr. BLANTON. And the conferees have stricken that from the bill?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The conferees did some good work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 24, 32, 33, 34, 37, 48, 74, 85, 86, 91, 92, 95, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, and 137, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$96,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000," and in line 7, strike out "\$103,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Forest Service: For construction of improvements for the protection and administration of the national forests, including telephone lines, firebreaks, dwellings, offices, miscellaneous small structures, and for fences and water-development projects for range control and other purposes and for combating epidemic insect infestations on the national forests adjacent to Yellowstone National Park and threatening the park timber and invaluable timber stands in northern Idaho, \$354,800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Bureau of Biological Survey: For construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and other structures, dams, fences, telephone lines, roads, installation of electricity and water system, cold-storage plants, septic

tanks, and for surveying wild life refuges, etc., in connection with bird and game reservation and other field activities in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, or elsewhere, and for the control of injurious predatory animals and rodents, \$300,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Tuberculosis building: For the construction and equipment of the second floor of the tuberculosis building, \$120,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 8, 11, 15, and 18 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following respective amounts: "\$206,000, \$18,000, \$11,000, \$15,000," and in line 18, strike out the sum "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: Improvement of heating system, \$20,000; improvement of power plant, \$25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Submarine base, New London, Conn.: Replace building numbered 42 damaged by fire, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"AIR CORPS

"Air Corps, Army: For construction and repair of technical buildings, \$504,800; and torque stands and repair of buildings and equipment, \$366,300; in all, \$871,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$471,005"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard: For construction of buildings and utilities at camps, \$1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered

100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Cemeterial expenses: For general repairs at national cemeteries, \$131,712."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 4, 18, 27, 76, 79, and 105.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
EDWARD H. WASON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES
REED SMOOT,
FREDERICK HALE,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments:

On Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for the expenses of the Senate in the amounts and for the purposes proposed by such Senate amendments.

On Nos. 10 to 17, inclusive, relating to emergency construction under the Department of Agriculture: Appropriates \$12,500, as proposed by the Senate, for clearing and fencing land at the experimental farm, Bureau of Animal Husbandry, Beltsville, Md.; appropriates \$50,000, instead of \$96,000 as proposed by the Senate, for improvements at the experimental dairy farm, Beltsville, Md.; appropriates \$75,000, instead of \$130,750 as proposed by the Senate, for general improvements at various field stations of the Bureau of Plant Industry; appropriates \$354,800, instead of \$533,800 as proposed by the Senate, for physical improvements in national forests and for combating epidemic insect infestations on national forests adjacent to Yellowstone Park; appropriates \$300,000, instead of \$504,605 as proposed by the Senate, for physical improvements in connection with bird and game reservations and other field activities under the Bureau of Biological Survey and for control of injurious predatory animals and rodents.

On No. 19: Makes the emergency appropriation for roads and trails in national parks available for continuing construction of an approach road from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.

On Nos. 20 to 26, inclusive, relating to emergency construction under the Bureau of Indian Affairs: Appropriates \$13,000, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and repair of telephone lines within the Southern Navajo subdivision of the Navajo Reservation in Arizona; appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for administration of Indian forests; strikes out the \$150,000, proposed by the Senate, for the irrigation system on the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona; appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for one-half of the cost for reconstruction and improvement of the road across the Wind River Reservation, Wyo.; appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for

construction, repair, and maintenance of roads on Indian reservations not eligible to Government aid under the Federal highway act.

On Nos. 28, 29, and 30, relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital: Appropriates \$120,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a second story on the tuberculosis building and \$75,000 for general repairs to old buildings, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 31, relating to Howard University: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for grading, fencing, excavating, and other physical improvements to the grounds of Howard University, modified so as to remove the subdivision of amounts for different purposes proposed by the Senate.

On No. 32: Eliminates a subtotal in the bill.

On Nos. 33 and 34, relating to the Department of Labor: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,000,000, inserted by the Senate, for carrying out the provisions of proposed legislation concerning the welfare of maternity and infancy, which has not yet become law; strikes out the appropriation of \$40,000 proposed by the Senate for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

On Nos. 35 and 36: Appropriates \$1,388.93 additional for payment for naval vessel damage claims allowed by the Navy Department and certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On No. 37: Strikes out the appropriation of \$3,000,000, inserted by the Senate, for carrying into effect the provisions of proposed legislation concerning the modernization of battleships, which has not yet become law.

On Nos. 38 to 74, inclusive, relating to emergency construction under the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department: Appropriates \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general maintenance of yards and docks; appropriates \$4,420,000, instead of \$4,670,000 as proposed by the Senate, toward physical improvements at navy yards and naval stations, as follows:

The items eliminated are as follows:

Extension of sea wall, Washington, D. C., navy yard, \$275,000.

Improvement of shipbuilding ways, Charleston (S. C.) Navy Yard, \$150,000.

Extension of laboratory building, \$125,000, and improvement of pier, research laboratory, \$60,000, Bellevue, District of Columbia.

General repairs, submarine base, New London, Conn., \$15,000.

The items agreed to and included for commencement of work under the appropriation of \$4,420,000 are to be undertaken at not to exceed the following total costs:

Navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Extension of building No. 98, \$35,000; extension of building No. 115, \$50,000.

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: Renew roof of building No. 105, \$80,000; paving, to continue, \$60,000; improvement of water front, \$50,000; improvement of electric system, \$150,000; crane facilities, marine railway, \$50,000.

Navy yard, New York, N. Y.: Extension of dispensary, \$35,000; improvement of dry dock No. 2, \$749,000; improvement of water front, \$200,000; improvement of building No. 28, \$60,000; improvement of power plant, \$80,000; improvement of roofs, \$70,000.

Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Improvement of power plant, \$90,000; improvement of dry dock crane, \$25,000; improvement of electric system, \$35,000; improvement of power plant, \$35,000; improvement of buildings, \$100,000; improvement of water front, \$50,000.

Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: Improvement of heating system, \$20,000; improvement of power plant, \$25,000.

Navy yard, Norfolk, Va.: Improvement of boiler-shop facilities, \$150,000; extension of woodworking shop, \$150,000; improvement of distributing systems, \$200,000; paving, to continue, \$70,000; improvement of railroad system, \$60,000.

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: Improvement of fire protection, \$75,000; floating derrick, \$100,000.

Navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.: Extension of fuel-oil system, \$75,000; fireproof vaults, \$25,000; improvement of power

plant, \$75,000; paving, to continue, \$50,000; improvement of dry dock No. 1, \$400,000; improvement of tracks, \$50,000.

Naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.: Replacement of pier No. 7, \$800,000; improvement of oil storage, \$50,000.

Naval station, San Diego, Calif.: Quay wall and dredging, \$210,000; improvement of crane tracks, \$60,000; floating derrick, \$100,000.

Naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I.: Extension of assembly shop, \$125,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hingham, Mass.: Improvement of water front, \$55,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Fort Mifflin, Pa.: Improvement of railroad, \$70,000.

Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Wash.: Improvement of fire protection, \$15,000.

Naval training station, Rhode Island: Improvement of power plant and steam system, \$50,000; improvement of Government landing, Newport, \$60,000.

Naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., buildings: Improvement of detention unit, \$105,000; extension of seaplane hangar, naval reserve, \$20,000.

Naval training station, San Diego, Calif.: Extension of mess hall, \$115,000.

Depot of supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.: Extension of shop building, \$225,000.

Marine barracks, Quantico, Va.: Roads, walks, service systems, and power-plant equipment, \$160,000; improvement of heating system, \$60,000.

Marine barracks, Parris Island, S. C.: Improvement of roads, \$100,000.

Marine barracks, San Diego, Calif.: Extension of storehouse, \$150,000.

Submarine base, New London, Conn.: Replace building No. 42 damaged by fire, \$50,000.

Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.: Extension of tracks, service systems, roads, and walks, \$75,000.

Naval aircraft factory, Philadelphia, Pa.: Seaplane runway, \$75,000; extension of sea wall, \$100,000.

Naval air station, Hampton Roads, Va.: Resurfacing seaplane runways, \$50,000; extension of hangar and shop building, \$150,000.

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.: Improvement of landplane field, \$100,000; filling and grading, \$400,000.

Naval air station, San Diego, Calif.: Extension of barracks buildings, \$95,000; improvement of gasoline storage, \$50,000; resurfacing seaplane runway, \$25,000.

Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.: Extension of main building, \$175,000.

Naval hospital, Newport, R. I.: Extension of main building, \$150,000.

Naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.: Replacement of landing, \$45,000.

Naval hospital, Puget Sound, Wash.: Extension of main building, \$150,000; extension of administration building, \$50,000.

On Nos. 75, 77, and 78, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates \$70,000 as proposed by the Senate for rebuilding and repairing stations of the Coast Guard.

On Nos. 80 to 104, inclusive, and 106 to 109, inclusive, relating to the War Department: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,678,953, proposed by the Senate, for alteration and repair of boats; strikes out the appropriation of \$2,843,544, proposed by the Senate, for repair of buildings and roads at military posts; appropriates \$42,500 for repair of roads and buildings at Army general hospitals; appropriates \$730,030, as proposed by the Senate, for continuation of construction on Army housing program; appropriates \$92,700, as proposed by the Senate, for construction of a magazine, extension of wharf, and miscellaneous repairs in connection with seacoast defenses of the United States under the Engineer Department; strikes out the appropriations of \$266,600 and \$292,800, respectively, proposed by the Senate, for seacoast defenses of the United States under the Coast Artillery and for seacoast defenses, Panama Canal, under the Coast Artillery; appropriates \$504,800 for construction and repair of technical buildings and \$366,300 for torque stands and repair of buildings and equipment for the Air Corps, and

strikes out the appropriation of \$2,654,162 for the procurement of additional airplanes; strikes out the appropriation of \$430,183, proposed by the Senate, for overhaul and preservation of ordnance matériel; appropriates \$471,005, instead of \$1,203,631, as proposed by the Senate, for general and specific repairs at arsenals of the Ordnance Department; appropriates \$50,000, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repair of reserve chemical plants of the Chemical Warfare Service; appropriates \$1,000,000, instead of \$1,205,752, as proposed by the Senate, for construction of buildings and utilities at camps of the National Guard; appropriates \$750,000, instead of \$1,465,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and alterations to buildings, roads, and other facilities at the Military Academy; appropriates \$131,712, instead of \$520,900, as proposed by the Senate, for physical improvements at national cemeteries modified so as to limit the amount to general repairs at 43 national cemeteries; appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a road at Gettysburg National Military Park; appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for roads in the Antietam Battlefield; appropriates \$90,000, as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of roads and grounds at Fort McHenry, Md., and Chalmette, La., national monuments; and appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general improvements at the Lincoln Birthplace Memorial.

On Nos. 110 to 117, inclusive, relating to property-damage claims settled under existing law: Appropriates \$1,500.33 additional, as proposed by the Senate, to cover claims determined by the departments and certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 118 to 121, inclusive, relating to judgments of the United States courts: Appropriates \$9,996.79 additional, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of judgments certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 122 to 128, inclusive, relative to judgments of the Court of Claims: Appropriates \$2,295,432.08 additional, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of judgments certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House, with the exception of judgment J-543, in favor of the Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co., amounting to \$227,239.53, consideration of which is postponed to the second deficiency bill.

On Nos. 129 to 136, inclusive, relating to audited claims allowed by the General Accounting Office: Appropriates \$46,120.19 and \$29,365.40, respectively, additional, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On No. 137: Corrects a section number in the bill.

DISAGREEMENTS

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

On No. 4: Relating to the date of commencement of payment of salaries of Senators.

On No. 18: Suspending for five years, commencing with the fiscal year 1931, the annual payments required to be made to the Treasury from the reclamation fund as reimbursement for advances made in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 25, 1910.

On No. 27: Appropriating \$400,000 for a new vessel for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for use in Alaska to replace an existing vessel of the Office of Education.

On No. 76: Modifying the authorization for the Lynchburg, Va., post office and courthouse project.

On No. 79: Appropriating \$3,000,000 to the Public Health Service for rural sanitation.

On No. 105: Appropriating \$256,000 and an unexpended balance of \$50,000 for a concrete road from the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., to the Corinth National Cemetery, Miss.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
EDWARD H. WASON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief statement of what is in the conference report.

The bill as it passed the Senate carried \$125,537,985.12.

The bill as it passed the House carried \$93,222,671.40.

There was added by the Senate \$32,315,313.72.

The House has receded and agreed to items amounting to \$13,425,150.72, and the House managers will recommend that the House agree to other items now in disagreement which will add to the House recessions to the amount of \$2,656,000, so that the total House recessions will aggregate \$16,081,150.72.

The Senate has receded from items totaling \$15,234,163.

The Senate will recede from \$1,000,000 if the recommendations of the House managers on certain amendments in disagreement are agreed to. So that the total Senate recessions will then aggregate \$16,234,163.

The recessions of the Senate and the House therefore are practically equal.

The bill as agreed upon will aggregate \$109,303,822.12.

The bill will carry for construction purposes as agreed upon and if the recommendations of the managers are adopted—for Federal-aid highways \$34,000,000, and for miscellaneous construction under various departments, \$11,562,347, or a total to be immediately available for construction work of \$45,562,347.

Now, if there are no questions, I will ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"That Public Resolution No. 87, approved February 10, 1923 (42 Stat. 1225), is amended to read as follows: That salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies in the Senate shall commence on the day of their appointment and continue until their successors are elected and qualified; and salaries of Senators elected to fill such vacancies shall commence on the day they qualify: *Provided*, That when no appointments have been made the salaries of Senators elected to fill such vacancies shall commence on the day following their election: *Provided further*, That when Senators have been elected during a sine die adjournment of the Senate, at a time other than a general election, to succeed appointees, the salaries of Senators so elected shall commence on the day following their election, and the salaries of such appointees shall cease on that date."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This is a Senate matter and has to do solely with the time when the salary of the new Senator from Vermont shall commence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 12, after line 21, insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"The annual payments required to be made from the reclamation fund to the general funds in the Treasury, as reimbursement for advances made in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize advances to the "reclamation fund," and for the issue and disposal of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor, and for other purposes,' approved June 25, 1910, as amended, are hereby suspended for a period of five years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 18 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 5 of the matter inserted strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my chairman I will state this: The purpose of this amendment is to save the situation in the reclamation fund and avoid, as far

as possible, the laying off of men now engaged in construction work on projects.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I find that it is the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation to suspend work on the drainage of the Belle Fourche and other projects. Will this amendment make it possible for the bureau to continue work in connection with the drainage on the Belle Fourche and other projects?

Mr. CRAMTON. I could not state in respect to any particular project. It has been our effort in the Interior appropriation bill each year to make appropriations for reclamation work that would not exceed the amount that would be in the fund, and we proceeded upon that theory with the assurance given us by the bureau as to available funds. For instance, this year when we were making appropriations for the ensuing year we were told that there would be in the fund the 1st of next July a balance of four and a half million dollars after carrying on the present program of work, but now it develops that because their program of work with favorable weather has progressed more rapidly than they expected, and because the projects have not been making their payments as fully as was expected, for various reasons, and because the revenues coming into the reclamation fund from oil leases and otherwise have proven to be less than was expected, the situation is that instead of having enough to carry on current contracts and leave a balance of four and a half million dollars the 1st of next July, they will have to suspend work pretty soon and lay off men unless some relief is given them. For that relief two things have been suggested. First, in this bill an amendment was inserted in the Senate that for five years the repayments from the reclamation fund to the Federal Treasury of \$1,000,000 a year should be suspended. Twenty years ago the Treasury loaned the reclamation fund \$20,000,000, the repayment of which was to commence in 10 years. About \$10,000,000 has been repaid, \$1,000,000 annually, and further payments are due each year. The Senate amendment proposed a moratorium of five years in those payments. The House position as presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], and with the consent of Senator Jones, who introduced the amendment in the Senate, provides for a moratorium for the current year and next year.

A moratorium of the payment three years from now would not help the present emergency, or four years from now; but for two years will restore to the reclamation fund \$500,000 that has already been paid this fiscal year, and \$500,000 that is to be paid on the 1st of April and the 1st of July, and then save to the reclamation fund \$1,000,000 that would come in next year.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Merely to emphasize at this point the fact that the Reclamation Service has for a period of about 10 years never defaulted in the meeting of this obligation—

Mr. CRAMTON. That is true.

Mr. LEAVITT. And all this proposal does is to postpone payments because of a shortage of funds partly due to the falling off in oil leases and returns from the sale of public lands as well as default in payment on some of the projects.

Mr. CRAMTON. In addition to this proposition there is pending in the Budget a proposal to advance an additional \$5,000,000 from the Treasury to the reclamation fund. While it is not entirely in issue here, may I make this observation? Personally it has seemed to me that while we must recognize the present emergency, and that we should avoid throwing men out of work who are now engaged in current contracts, yet I think we should proceed with conservatism on any further advance from the Federal fund to the reclamation fund that arises in great part because of failure of projects to make their payments, because I think it should be sunk into the consciousness of the people of the West that when projects in the West fail to make their payments or ask unduly long periods of time within which to

make them they do not injure Michigan and Indiana and the East but they injure their own sister communities in the West who are wanting to use this same money as a revolving fund.

I fear that if we go very far in making further advances to carry on the construction program to meet the situation, created in large part by the failure of these projects to make their payments, we only encourage projects to continue to default in their payments.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. May I say to the gentleman that as far as the project in my State is concerned there has been no default since the new contract was entered into some years ago.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is true.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The dredging machinery is all on the ground. The equipment is all there. The work can go forward now much cheaper than it could if it is abandoned for a year or two and the machinery carted away or the machinery allowed to become rusty or in bad condition. It is essential that the drainage continue throughout the coming year. Many of the lands have become alkaline, and the only chance of getting them back into production is to get the drainage finished.

Mr. CRAMTON. I recognize that. We do not need to debate the \$5,000,000 advance now, but as far as the item before us is concerned, everything that was in the Senate amendment that will help the present emergency is in this Wood amendment, and no more than is needed in the present emergency.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is there any possibility of getting the \$5,000,000 proposal now before the Budget passed by Congress?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no information on that, and I think the gentleman would not want me to express my guess.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. I understand a bill was introduced only yesterday providing for that loan.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. The Commissioner of Reclamation made this statement before the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation that construction work on these projects now under way, under contract to some extent, but which must be expanded to some new contracts to carry out a moral obligation at least, can be done more cheaply now than at any other time in the history of the service.

Mr. CRAMTON. That might be true, but as to these new contracts for next year, this should be modified in conformity to the present reclamation fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The question is on agreeing on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"New vessel: For construction of a new vessel with a carrying capacity of not less than 1,300 tons to take the place of the *Bozer*, \$400,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Mr. Wood moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 27 and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out the first line of the matter inserted by such amendment.

Mr. WOOD. That is just striking out the heading.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House for what purpose this vessel is used in the Office of Education?

Mr. WOOD. I may state to the gentleman and the House that this vessel is for the purpose of carrying supplies all around the border of Alaska. They have a little vessel up there called the *Boxer*, that has been in use for some time. In the first place, it is inadequate, and it has to make three or four trips a year to do the work that one vessel should do and could do in a continuous trip. In consequence, they have to ship a great portion of their goods in commercial vessels. We are paying \$38,000 a year freight in consequence of that having to be done. If this appropriation is allowed, it will save that \$38,000 a year that we are paying to commercial carriers, and we will also expedite and simplify the business by reason of its being done in fewer trips.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the purpose that this vessel shall ply only in Alaskan waters, or is it the purpose to have it take on supplies at Seattle, for instance, and then go direct to various posts in Alaska?

Mr. WOOD. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then part of the purpose is to take revenue away from steamship lines? I am in sympathy, and every one must be in sympathy, with the idea of providing an up-to-date vessel for the transfer of supplies to the posts in Alaskan waters. I am questioning whether we should go into the business of equipping a vessel to enter into competition with established shipping lines leaving Seattle or other coast points.

Mr. WOOD. Of course, that will be the result, to that extent, and that extent only, but the inconvenience to which the people in the interior are subjected by reason of the fact they have neither a continuous supply by the service of the boat we now have, and the very irregular service they get from commercial boats up there, is not only a very great inconvenience but also a very great hardship.

Mr. STAFFORD. But, are we to adopt the policy of having a large enough vessel to carry supplies from United States ports to all the points in Alaska? Will that vessel be adequate for the service, or will we be confronted with a demand for other vessels to perform services that are now being performed by existing mercantile lines?

Mr. CRAMTON. May I state to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that this is to be used in connection with the education and health work among the natives of Alaska who are chiefly found around the coast of Alaska on up to the Arctic Circle.

Mr. STAFFORD. And to that I have no objection whatsoever.

Mr. CRAMTON. We are not so much concerned about getting supplies to Juneau or Sitka; but to get a satisfactory service to reach the natives in the remote sections where there is not an established service this vessel is highly important, and that is the occasion for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understood the explanation of the chairman of the committee, it is proposed to change the method of assembling supplies by having a Government vessel, sufficiently large, go to the ports on the Pacific coast—Seattle, Portland, and the like—and take the supplies direct to these ports in the far north.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the most economical way in which to make the distribution. There is no occasion for shipping the supplies from Seattle to Juneau and then transferring them to a vessel which will take them farther north. Let me emphasize that on the return trip the vessel is to be used largely in bringing down the reindeer meat, the property of the natives of Alaska, and not the commercial reindeer meat, but that reindeer meat which belongs to the natives of Alaska.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some questions—although I know very little about the conditions—as to the advisability of having the Government equip a vessel which will operate

between the supply points on the Pacific coast, rather than to have a disbursing vessel get its supplies from Juneau or some other point now served by mercantile lines.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand it, this vessel is to ply in the far north and will run to many points where commercial lines do not connect and operate. Under present circumstances small vessels are obliged to take merchandise and supplies to various points, while this vessel will run to the Arctic Ocean.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not objecting to a vessel being used in the Alaskan waters, but I question the practicability of having the Government launch on the policy of equipping a large vessel which will be designed for long hauls go to the Pacific ports and get supplies when there are mercantile lines rendering that service to-day.

Mr. MILLER. The vessels which go to the far north out of Seattle do not go anywhere near Juneau, not within 1,000 miles of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 76: On page 25, after line 15, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT

"Lynchburg, Va., post office and courthouse: There is hereby authorized and directed to be acquired for this project for the sum of \$183,000, by purchase agreement with the owner notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, subdivisions of lot 8, city block, Nos. 214 and 216, abutting on Ninth Street and immediately adjoining the property of the United States Government, including the building thereon. The appropriations made for this project under the provisions of the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 921), and of the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, approved March 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 119), shall be available for payment of said sum of \$183,000, to be paid in full settlement and release of all claims and demands of whatsoever nature or character arising out of or in any manner connected with the acquisition hereunder authorized. The owner and occupant of the property authorized to be acquired hereunder shall be afforded a reasonable time, not exceeding 12 months from the date of approval hereof, within which to remove his plant therefrom and to another site."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: Page 26, after line 17, insert:

"There is hereby appropriated to the Treasury Department for the Public Health Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, any unexpended balance of which shall be available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, for cooperation with State health departments in rural sanitation, including medicines, biological products, personal and medical services, the sum of \$3,000,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including the purchase and distribution of medical supplies, in the drought-stricken areas, and including personal services, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation unless the State, county, or municipality affected agrees to pay such proportion of the expenses of such demonstration work as shall be required in regulations to be prescribed by the Public Health Service, in which due consideration shall be given to State and local economic conditions and human needs, the extent and circumstances of such cooperation in each case to be reported to Congress at the beginning of each regular session."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think every Member of the House would be interested in an explanation by the chairman of the committee as to the purpose of the conferees representing the House in presenting this amendment for relief of drought-stricken areas.

Mr. WOOD. I will say in answer to the gentleman that we had hearings upon this item at the same time we had hearings with reference to the \$25,000,000 proposition. Since those hearings we have consulted with the Red Cross and the Public Health Service as to this rural-sanitation item. There may or may not be any occasion for this amount of money or for any portion of it, but in the event there should be some occasion for it, under the restrictions provided in the measure, we felt it was only proper that the sum of \$2,000,000 instead of \$3,000,000 should be given to the Public Health Service for use in case of need.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the purpose of this amendment it is that in case of the spread of disease, occasioned by present distressed conditions in the drought-stricken areas, the Public Health Service will have ample funds to come to the rescue.

Mr. WOOD. That is the purpose of it, and it is following the same line of action that was followed during the Mississippi River floods. There may or may not be any spread of disease, and we hope there will not be any such spread of disease. But, of course, if there is we want them to be able to meet whatever need may arise. It is for the purpose of providing against that possible contingency that the appropriation is made.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Is this appropriation in addition to the other funds that have been appropriated for the Public Health Service?

Mr. WOOD. It is.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. This appropriation is to be limited to the drought-stricken areas and the other general work of the Public Health Service can go on?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is this for medical supplies and things of that kind?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is it the so-called Robinson amendment which was put in in the Senate?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; it is practically that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 105: Page 29, after line 11, insert:

"Shiloh National Military Park: For rebuilding and resurfacing with concrete the road situated in Shiloh National Military Park in Tennessee from the original boundaries of the park to the Corinth National Cemetery at Corinth, Miss., at a limit of cost of \$306,000, there is hereby reappropriated the sum of \$50,000 appropriated for said road in the act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, approved May 28, 1930, and also there is hereby appropriated the additional sum of \$256,000, all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War under the terms of this act instead of under the terms of said act of May 28, 1930."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CHIEF BOATSWAIN EDWARD SWEENEY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2335) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States

Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent, by authority of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2335, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the same. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "lieutenant," insert "(junior grade)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list of the Navy."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill was on the Private Calendar in the last session and passed the Congress.

Mr. HALE. That is right. The House bill provided for promoting this man from chief boatswain to lieutenant. The Senate amendment limits the promotion to lieutenant, junior grade, and the Senate amendment conforms with the recommendation made by the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

ORGANIC ACT OF PORTO RICO

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report to accompany the bill (H. R. 14560) to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill H. R. 14560. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CLAIM OF WILLIAM LOUIS PITTHAN (H. DOC 736)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I inclose a report concerning a claim against the United States presented by Mr. William Louis Pitthan for services rendered as extradition agent in the matter of the application for the extradition from England of Claude W. Daniels. The report requests that the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$210 to pay the claim submitted by Mr. Pitthan.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$210 to pay Mr. Pitthan for the services rendered by him.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 1931.

(Inclosure: Report from the Secretary of State.)

M'ILWRAITH M'EACHARN'S LINE, PROPRIETARY (LTD.)

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4120) for present consideration, a similar bill having been reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 12.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4120) and consider the same. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 4120

An act for the relief of McIlwraith McEacharn's Line, Proprietary (Ltd.)

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of McIlwraith McEacharn's Line, Proprietary (Ltd.), against the United States for damages and loss alleged to have been sustained by it as a result of the collision between the U. S. S. *MacDonough* and the Australian coal barge *Werfa*, which occurred in Victoria Basin, Melbourne, Australia, on or about August 5, 1925, may be determined in a suit to be brought by the said claimant against the

United States in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court in admiralty cases, and that said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages, without interest and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the McIlwraith McEacharn's Line, Proprietary (Ltd.), or against the McIlwraith McEacharn's Line, Proprietary (Ltd.), in favor of the United States, sustained by reason of said collision, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by the order of the said court, and upon the receipt of such notice it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in the district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That such suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the approval of this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a similar bill is on the House Calendar, which will be reached before the adjournment of this session. I question very much the practicability of taking Senate bills from the Speaker's table when there are similar bills on the Private Calendar before those bills have been reached in the usual order. It may be that in the closing days of the session we may be beset with a condition that would require taking them up out of the regular order, but in fairness to the committees appointed on both sides to pass upon these private bills before they are called up for consideration, I think it would be establishing a bad precedent to single out those bills for preferment which happen to have been passed by the Senate. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania under my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEMPLE. If the gentleman will allow me to make a statement. The reason for asking action to-day is not because the bill happens to have been passed by the Senate. That gives the opportunity, but the reason is much deeper than that.

May I make a statement of the facts? In 1925 two squadrons of the American Battle Fleet went to Australia on a friendly visit for the purpose of strengthening the cordial relations between the United States Government and that Commonwealth. When they were about to leave they needed coal, of course, and a collier, the *Werfa*, supplied coal to the fleet and had about 1,200 tons remaining. She tied up overnight, where she had a right to tie up, and the next morning one of our vessels jammed into her and sunk the *Werfa* with the remainder of the cargo on board.

A board of investigation of the naval officers of the United States was called immediately and they determined that the responsibility was ours. The owners were notified that they must present their claim to the consul. They did so on the same day; that is, the first day after the accident. There was long correspondence between the consul and the State Department in Washington and between the State Department and the Navy Department, and, finally, the owners were notified that their recourse was not to file a claim with the consul, but to enter suit in the United States courts; but they did not receive this notice until after the statute of limitations had begun to run. They had presented their claim to the American consul, on the assurance that he was the proper officer to receive it. They were thus lulled into a feeling of security, and then, after time fixed in the statute of limitations, but still on the advice of the State Department they did enter suit in the United States court, and the Department of Justice pleaded the statute of limitations against them.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances the honor of the United States is involved, and the sooner we dispose of the matter the better.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, there are several bills of similar purport where the honor of the United States is involved. This would establish a bad precedent. We have not come to the pass where we will have to take it up out of order. I can give reasonable assurance to the gentleman that this bill will be reached on the Private Calendar, and when the House bill is reached it is the usual order to substitute the Senate bill. It will then be

enacted into law, and it will only be a matter of a couple of weeks.

Mr. TEMPLE. There are 290 bills on the Private Calendar that come up before this, and I doubt very much whether we reach it in the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will do what I can before the close of the session to get the bill up if it is not reached in the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say that there are a few of us that give careful study to these bills when called up in the proper order. We have our files on same in our office, but they are not now before us and we are prepared, when we have our files, to make sane objections or let them go through.

Mr. TEMPLE. I do not think the gentleman would be prepared to make any sane objection to this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it is fair to us who do consider these matters to call them up when we have not our files before us?

Mr. TEMPLE. I think it is fair for me to ask unanimous consent. If the gentleman wishes to refuse consent, that is his responsibility.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object for the reason stated.

THE CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned yesterday unanimous consent was given for consideration of the bill H. R. 13584 under Calendar Wednesday rule, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13584, to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims."

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the bill should be considered for a few minutes in the committee, so I object.

The House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be considered in lieu of the original bill and that the first reading be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON].

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I will endeavor to state as briefly as I can the purpose of this amendment.

On May 14, 1926, this House passed a jurisdictional bill authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to sue in the Court of Claims. When they got into court they found that the court construed the term "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota" to include only those Indians who sustained tribal relations, who resided upon the reservation, and who had been enrolled as Chippewas by the Secretary of the Interior.

That left out of account all those Chippewas who had for some reason or other left the reservation and scattered among other tribes or who were living among the whites.

In order that the controversies involved in the suit might be adjudicated and the rights of all parties in interest might be settled an amendment to the original act became necessary.

The amendment to section 1 reads as follows:

In any such suit or suits the plaintiffs, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, shall be considered as including and representing all those entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent fund provided for by section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, and the agreement entered into thereunder.

The act of 1889 provides in section 7 in substance that the Chippewa Indians shall be enrolled. Then it provides that certain portions of the "permanent fund" shall be expended for certain purposes during the 50-year period. It makes provision for the distribution of the 5 per cent interest earnings to the Chippewa Indians. The Secretary of the Interior has held that the interest of the fund can be distributed only to the Indians who sustain tribal relations on the theory that it goes to the tribe and not to the Chippewa Indians as individuals. Such Indians are held to include only those residing upon the reservation and who are enrolled.

On the other hand, the basic act of 1889 provides that the residue of the permanent fund which is to be held in trust by the Government of the United States for a period of 50 years, and thereafter to be distributed, shall be distributed to the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, "and their issue." We are not trying to determine in this bill, nor are we seeking to have the Court of Claims determine who the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota are, or what construction shall be given to the language of the act of 1889. What we do, in effect, is this: We permit the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to sue, and we do not limit the plaintiffs to those who sustain tribal relations, but permit all Indians of Chippewa blood to be joined as parties plaintiff.

The act of 1926 provides that whatever recovery there may be shall be placed in the general Chippewa permanent fund and become a part of that fund, which means that whatever is left of the judgment, if any, will be distributed at the end of the 50-year period as a part of the permanent fund. The judgment, in place of being distributed to the Indians who now reside on the reservation or those who may reside there at the end of the 50-year period and who are the only ones included in the term "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota" by the Secretary of the Interior, will be distributed to those Indians, whoever they may be, who are described in the act of 1889 as "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and their issue." Who those people then are will have to be determined at the end of the 50-year period, and can not be determined by the Court of Claims, but will have to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior, made on this bill as originally introduced, objected to the amendment on the ground that the amendment would have the effect of giving to the Court of Claims authority to determine who the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota are, and says that the Kadrie case disposed of that question by determining that the Secretary of the Interior has exclusive authority to make up the rolls and to determine who are entitled to take under the treaty. We have eliminated that amendment to the original jurisdictional act of 1926 because of the objection raised by the Secretary of the Interior and have written into the bill the amendment that we now have, which provides, not that the Court of Claims shall determine who the Chippewa Indians are, but that the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall be construed as including those Indians who are entitled to interest and to final distribution at the end of the 50-year period, whoever they may be. The court is not called on to say who they are. That question is left open to be determined at the appropriate time. The jurisdictional act of 1926 as construed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Court of Claims would have the result of excluding all of the Indians who are not now enrolled members of the tribe, but we do not believe that the suit should be conducted along those narrow lines, because it would eliminate a number of claims. The suit should dispose of all Chippewa claims by permitting those who are included in the act of 1889 to sue.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE. Does the gentleman hold that the Secretary of the Interior has exclusive right to determine who are the members of the tribe?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think there is no doubt about the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to determine who are the members of the tribe. Under existing law he has

that authority and the court will not review his decision in the matter.

Mr. BROWNE. Has that been determined?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Oh, yes; the Kadrie case disposes of this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the substitute, it is identical with section 1 of the original bill as introduced other than that it does not contain the last clause of the paragraph which reads as follows:

And any judgment entered shall recognize and enforce the right of, and be conclusive upon, all such present or future beneficiaries under said act and agreements.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; the new language starts on page 3, in line 23, with the words at the end of the line—

In any suit or suits the plaintiff—

And so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows that, but it is identical with the language as carried in the original bill, section 1, other than the language that I have just referred to, which is the last clause of section 1.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to get the viewpoint of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, so far as the proposed substitute is concerned. I direct the gentleman's attention to the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which was adverse to the original bill, and to the following language:

This part of the amendment to section 1 apparently would also compel the court to take from the amount of any judgment recovered by these Indians certain amounts which should be paid to those legally entitled to enrollment under existing law and award such amounts to certain persons who have no rights to share with the members of the different bands of Chippewa Indians. It is believed that this would create a liability against the United States and make it necessary to restore such payments to the Chippewa funds from the Treasury of the United States.

From the explanation of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON], we would all conclude that there would be no added obligation whatsoever on the United States; that it is only a question of the distribution of the funds that would be ultimately determined. However, the language that I have just read would seem to indicate the opinion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that there would probably be an additional obligation on the United States. I am asking for information from the person who has given more study to this question than any other, and I want to know whether the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is correct in his conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say to the gentleman that the language which the original amendment carried, and to which the Secretary of the Interior objected, might be subject to the objection that he raised, although I doubt that it is. What he objected to was the original amendment proposed in the bill as introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTEMBERG]. He claimed that this would have the effect of permitting the Court of Claims to determine who the Chippewas were.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am directing an inquiry to the criticism of the commissioner to section 1 as contained in the original bill, and I am pointing out further that the substitute is identical with section 1 of the original bill except as to the clause that I read. Therefore, the substitute, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, will entail an obligation of considerable amount upon the Treasury of the United States if it is adopted. Is the commissioner right, or not?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think the commissioner is right, even upon the bill as originally introduced, but we struck out the entire text and changed the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, you struck out several sections, but you did not change the language of section 1, which was the section that the commissioner militated against in the language I have just read, except by eliminating the clause at the end of the original section 1.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The commissioner does not object to the original section of the jurisdictional act. What he is objecting to is the new language which is proposed to be added to section 1 of the act of May 14, 1926. He does not raise any objection to the original act. He raised objection to the proposed amendment to section 1 only. The proposed amendment to section 1 is the language we have just read. That will not impose any additional liability upon the Government, no matter what the outcome of the suit may be, because the law provides that whatever the recovery may be shall be put into the Chippewa fund to be distributed at the end of the 50-year period, as provided by the act of 1889. The only question involved is to protect the plaintiffs to this suit in such manner that whoever may be construed to be Chippewa Indians at the end of the 50-year period, and their issue, shall be included among those who participate in the distribution of the judgment, if any.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman wish to give his assurance to the House that the bill as drafted will not entail additional obligations upon the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I can not see any possibility of it entailing any additional obligation upon the United States, because I do not think the contention of the Secretary of the Interior is correct when he states it may result in enlarging the obligation. At the end of the 50-year period it must be determined who are entitled to take the fund, and if it is then held that the Indians entitled to take are those who are members of the tribe at that time, how can an additional liability be created? But even if it should be held that those entitled to take are those who are members of the tribe at that time and also those who are scattered around the country who are not members of the tribe, but of Chippewa blood, it nevertheless can not create an additional liability, because under the jurisdictional act the parties plaintiff are the Indians who are described in the act of 1889 as Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and their issue.

If at the end of the period it should be held that that description includes those who are then members of the tribe and living upon the reservation and also those who are not members of the tribe, living outside the reservation, where could the additional liability of the Government be? I can not see any added liability whatever. The plaintiffs are entitled to such judgment as may be awarded and certainly if the reservation Indians do not include all the plaintiffs but get their proportional share they can have no cause for complaint.

Mr. STAFFORD. Further on in his indictment of the original bill, the commissioner points out that under the original authorization act to begin suits in the Court of Claims, five suits were begun. He says:

Of the other four suits one, No. H-155, contains, in the original petition, a claim for \$1,000,000 alleged to have been unlawfully paid to the persons for whose benefits it is believed this bill was in part introduced. After the decision of the Supreme Court in the case above cited, the attorneys filed an amended petition in this suit in which an effort was made to strengthen the position taken in the original petition notwithstanding the said decision and to reinsert the same question in the courts. In the amended petition, the claim of \$1,000,000 was apparently abandoned, and a claim in excess of \$150,000 was alleged.

Now—

Manifestly it would be inconsistent for the attorneys to pursue a claim against the United States for reimbursement in the Court of Claims, and at the same time request the court to hold the persons to whom payments were made, legally entitled to receive the moneys for which the claim is made.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have read that language. I can not understand what the Secretary of the Interior is driving at by the statement commencing "manifestly" and so forth. I do not see anything inconsistent in the position they are taking, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PITTINGER. Is not the whole purpose of this amendment to get all of the Indians interested in this litigation with all of their claims, before the court?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is all there is to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask in that connection, because the gentleman is deeply interested in this measure, does this authorize the retrial in the Court of Claims of any issue that has heretofore been passed upon in the Court of Claims?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; it does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or which has been adversely reported on appeal by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. That is not the effect of it. What it does do is to permit the petitions to be so amended, in pending suits or new suits, as to include as parties plain- tiffs the tribal Indians on the reservation and any other Indians who may be outside the reservation who are included in the term "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and their issue" as used in the act of 1889.

Mr. STAFFORD. These questions have not in any way heretofore been brought up in the Court of Claims or in any other court?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman go further and state that in this bill as presented there is found this language:

Which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is a part of the original act of 1926, and it is repeated here.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a part of the original act, and yet the Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated that the original bill, as I recall, would give the right of a retrial of matters that had heretofore been passed upon by the Court of Claims.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think that is what he meant to say. What he meant to say was that section 1 of the original act—that is, as amended in the original draft of the bill H. R. 13584—would have had that result, but the bill in its amended form will not have that result in my judgment. Only pending suits or new suits are affected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman take the position that under the original draft that could not have been the result?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; because the bill expressly states that they can not sue on any claims upon which there has been a former adjudication.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I wish to offer my apology to the gentleman. I have been led far afield in the consideration of this bill, because I bottomed my opposition to it on the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in which he stated that if we passed this bill it would make the Government possibly liable to a claim of \$1,000,000, to which they were not justly entitled, because it was res adjudicata.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. What he has reference to there is this: He says that the Secretary of the Interior is the only person who has the right to determine who the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota as a tribe are, and he says that under the Kadrie case that is res adjudicata, and he is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under this bill it is not intended to dispute the decision in the Kadrie case?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the gentleman does not dispute the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to determine who are properly enrolled as Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and who are to receive the benefits under this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. This bill does not affect that one way or the other. The Secretary has the undoubted right to determine who shall be enrolled as Chippewa Indians, but he does not have the right to say who shall be parties plaintiff in a jurisdictional bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. I have no objection to this bill, but I desire to offer an amendment which, I understand, is agreeable to the author of the bill. I desire to insert after the word "those," in line 1, page 4, the words "determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be." With the understand-

ing that that amendment is agreeable and will be adopted, I do not care to take any more time of the committee.

Mr. PITTINGER. There does not appear to be any objection to that amendment, if it does not affect the purpose of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment virtually confirms the position just taken by the gentleman from South Dakota, when he stated that they did not intend to override the power of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the enrollment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Exactly. I want to make it plain that the bill will not do that.

Mr. PITTINGER. I do not object to the amendment because it appears to be harmless. The bill does not deal with the question of enrollment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, I do not care to discuss the matter further.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HASTINGS. After the court has rendered a judgment I want the roll to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, and that is the purpose of the amendment. In making all of these rolls the office of the Secretary of the Interior is better equipped to make them than the Court of Claims. Of course, they would make them in accordance with the judgment of the Court of Claims.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think the amendment should be put in this bill because it will vitiate the very thing the bill seeks to do.

Mr. HASTINGS. This is a very important amendment. Let me say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I am familiar with the making of Indian rolls. I have given a great deal of time to the matter of assisting in the making of rolls of Indian tribes. I think I am pretty familiar with the question of making rolls and I think I know the danger of having them made by the Court of Claims.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. We are not leaving it to the Court of Claims. We are absolutely not doing anything of the kind. There will be no attempt made by the Court of Claims to make up these rolls, because the judges can not go into that at all.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand the author of the bill is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not care whether he is willing to accept it or not. He may be willing to accept it because he has not made a study of the legal phases of it. What the bill seeks to do is to have a determination as to those Indians who are entitled to participate in the distribution of the fund at the end of 50 years, and they are to be made plaintiffs. At the end of that period the Secretary will determine who are included in the act of 1889.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to discuss it further if it is not going to be acceptable to the author of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It is not acceptable to me because I know what the purpose of the bill is. Why should the Court of Claims have anything to do with determining who the Chippewa Indians are? What are we doing here? Here is what we are doing. We are simply saying that—

In any such suit or suits the plaintiff, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, shall be considered as including and representing all those entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent fund provided for by section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889.

Now, then, who are the Indians who are entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent fund? They are the Indians who are set out and defined in the act of 1889 as the "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and their issue." There is no need of the court making up a roll. It can not and will not.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then what will the court determine? It will determine the question of law and the question of the rights of groups of Indians.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. This bill determines who the claimants are and who are to be parties plaintiff.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that it will establish a dangerous precedent if

you take this authority away from the Secretary of the Interior.

I represented the Cherokee Tribe of Indians in making up of its rolls, and there were finally 41,798 of them. There were some 50,000 other people from Maine to California who made application to get on these rolls, and the Court of Claims is not equipped to go out and take testimony in each one of these cases and determine the right of an individual to be enrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. This is the danger. The right to participate in these funds is not determined by the question of Indian blood. It is not determined altogether by the question of descent. It takes three things to make you entitled to enrollment and to participate in the allotment of the lands and the distribution of the funds of the Five Civilized Tribes. First, of course, you had to be an Indian by blood of that tribe. But this was not all. If you were a full-blood Indian and if you could not speak a single word of the English language that would not entitle you, among the Five Civilized Tribes, to enrollment, and it would not entitle you to share in the distribution of the money. Two other things must concur. You must not only have been an Indian by blood, but you must have been a resident of the tribe and you must have been a recognized member of the tribe.

Now, let me tell the gentleman why. I have not read this patent, but practically every one of these patents to lands of the tribes contains a reversionary clause, making the land revert back to the United States if the tribe were dissolved or abandoned the same. In the Cherokee constitution we provided that whenever an Indian left the tribe he forfeited any right to allotment or to the distribution of the money. This was done in order to hold them together and in order that the land would not revert.

The people all over the United States have a mistaken idea about the question of the right of enrollment. In the act of June 28, 1898, which applied to the Five Civilized Tribes, in which provision was made for the making of the rolls, it was provided that only those should be enrolled who were actually living among the tribe. This was always the law.

So there are three things that are necessary. You must be an Indian by blood; you must have been a recognized member of the tribe—in other words, carried on the rolls and recognized by the membership as being a member of the tribe—and, third, you must be a resident of the tribe.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. All of which is conceded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does that rule apply with respect to the enrollment of all Indian tribes?

Mr. HASTINGS. I can not say that it does; but it applies to the Five Civilized Tribes and, generally speaking, I think it is true of all Indian tribes. If it does not, it should.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I want to get at the practical effect of the gentleman's amendment. The language of the bill is:

In any such suit or suits the plaintiff, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota—

Shall be whom?—

shall be considered as including and representing all those entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent fund provided for by section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889.

Now, there is no need, so far as the suit is concerned, of determining who the individuals of the Chippewa Indians are by making up an enrollment; but if the gentleman's amendment goes in the bill, what will be the effect? Will it not have the effect of doing the very thing which we are trying to get away from? The claimants do not desire to be bound by the present enrollment of the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota as made up by the Secretary of the Interior. We are seeking here to make parties plaintiff those who are

entitled to take under the act of 1889 and who are there described as the "Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and their issue."

Now, the court is not going to determine that now.

Mr. HASTINGS. After the court has decided the legal questions involved, how are you going to determine the Chippewa Indians or their descendants who are entitled to share in this judgment?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There will be no legal question to determine by the court so far as the plaintiffs are concerned.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does this make the court try each one of these individual cases and determine them?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Not at all.

Mr. HASTINGS. Who determines them?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is no determination one way or the other. The bill defines and says who the plaintiffs are in general terms.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am trying to have it determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is no need for anybody to determine that, so far as the parties plaintiff are concerned, because the bill defines who they are, and that is the only definition that is needed.

Mr. HASTINGS. I differ with the gentleman. I think there must be some question of fact there as to who the parties are.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood from the gentleman's statement on the floor, in answer to a query propounded by me, that the Secretary of the Interior would determine the enrollment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. He will in the end.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is all this amendment determines.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; you are determining the parties plaintiff now. How is the Secretary of the Interior going to determine the parties plaintiff now? It is none of his business who the parties plaintiff are in this suit. We are determining who they are by the language—

In any such suit or suits the plaintiff, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, shall be considered as including and representing all those entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent funds—

And so forth.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman prepare an amendment as a substitute for the amendment I have proposed which will make it absolutely certain that those entitled to participate after judgment will be upon a roll prepared and approved by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Under the existing law nobody else can determine that, and the court has repeatedly so held. He will determine that at the end of the 50-year period, and there is nobody else to determine it.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is all this amendment attempts to do.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. This amendment would have the effect of leaving it to the Secretary of the Interior to determine now who the plaintiffs shall be for the purposes of the suit. That is what we are trying to get away from.

Mr. PITTEGER. Mr. WILLIAMSON is correct. That is what we are trying to get away from. We do not want to go into the question of enrollment before the Court of Claims nor in this lawsuit.

Mr. HASTINGS. Would the gentleman have any objection to putting in after the word "thereunder," in line 4, a provision to this effect: "That the final roll of those entitled to participate in the distribution shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior"?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think that is unnecessary. The original act provided that such judgment as may be recovered shall be placed in the Chippewa's permanent fund. The act of 1889 provides how that fund shall be distributed.

Mr. HASTINGS. What objection can there be, what objection can the author of the bill have, to that sort of an amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have no objection, although I think it is wholly unnecessary.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, I tell you that I would not permit, if I could help it, a bill drawn like this for the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, with which I am familiar, for that would permit everybody who claims membership in these tribes from Maine to California to come in and have their rights adjudicated. We would never get through with that sort of a lawsuit.

Mr. PITTEGER. I want to say that one of the purposes of this bill is to get all the Indians and their claims in. The jurisdictional act contemplated two classes of Indians—one entitled to enrollment, and a second class, those entitled to share in the funds.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] has prepared an amendment authorizing the court to go into the question of the rights of both classes.

Somebody in the bureau has got a wrong idea of what we are trying to do.

I say frankly that I have another bill where that question of enrollment is involved, but it is in no way involved here. The only object of this is to get all the Indians before the court. The jurisdictional act was passed before I became a Member of Congress. A reputable attorney was employed to prosecute the suit. That attorney is up against the proposition of trying a half a lawsuit instead of determining the whole matter as far as the fund is concerned.

Mr. HASTINGS. With the assurance that has been given by the author of the bill and with the responsibility on him, I will yield my judgment to his.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 1 of an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party as in other cases, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statute of limitations, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642), or arising under or growing out of any subsequent act of Congress in relation to Indian affairs which said Chippewa Indians of Minnesota may have against the United States, which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States. In any such suit or suits the plaintiff, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, shall be considered as including and representing all those entitled to share in either the interest or in the final distribution of the permanent fund provided for by section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642), and the agreements entered into thereunder. This act shall apply to any and all suit or suits brought under said act of May 14, 1926, whether now pending or hereafter commenced."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4, after the word "thereunder" insert the following: "That nothing herein shall be considered to affect the powers of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the roll of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the purpose of making a final distribution of the permanent Chippewa funds."

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is agreeable to the author of the bill, and to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, and with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the

bill H. R. 13584 and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion by Mr. LEAVITT to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GEN. J. WARREN KEIFER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

LAW OFFICES, KEIFER & KEIFER,
Springfield, Ohio, February 3, 1931.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on behalf of my father, Gen. J. Warren Keifer, to acknowledge receipt of your message of January 30, extending to him felicitations of the House upon his birthday. He wishes me to say that he appreciates this kind expression exceedingly and only regrets that he is not able personally to make a fitting response thereto.

His health generally is quite good, but the feebleness incident to his age has gradually increased, until he gets out of his home only to take an occasional drive.

Thanking you personally for your consideration, I am,
Very truly yours,

WM. W. KEIFER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that the arrangement for the division of time in general debate under which we were operating on Tuesday be continued to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman expect to begin the reading of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. HOLADAY. I understand that is the hope.

Mr. CANNON. And in the meantime general debate will be continued until exhausted?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16738, the District of Columbia appropriation bill; and pending that, asks unanimous consent that until otherwise ordered general debate shall be controlled equally between himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. HOOPER in the chair.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I made a few remarks a few days ago with respect to a report which had appeared in the RECORD. Those remarks seem to have met with general approval throughout the length and breadth of the country, so far as I can judge by the letters that I have received and the editorials in the press, which almost universally express approval of the sentiments which I enunciated at that time. I have, however, received one letter taking me to task for my position and asking me to have the letter read into

the RECORD. Gentlemen can all imagine how far I would get if I should ask permission to insert in the RECORD an editorial or a letter, but I shall ask the privilege of reading one paragraph from this letter from the "star" investigator of an investigating committee that has been rather active in the past year:

The disclosures developed by the work of the so-called ——— committee demonstrates the vital need for the work it has been doing. It was indeed time that some authority should undertake that work; time that some authority, based on knowledge and understanding of the conditions and processes, should realize the necessity for protecting the national legislature from the destructive influences that have in so large measure of popular estimation virtually reduced the Congress of the United States to the level of a third-class municipal council huckstering over petty franchises, hack stands, sewer, and pavement jobs.

Mr. Chairman, that is not only an indictment of Congress, as it is presently constituted, without any differentiation as between the two bodies, but it is an indictment of every constituency in the land. The inference from this paragraph at least is that the public throughout the length and breadth of the United States is corrupt, venal, and on sale like the fish in the market stalls, to the highest bidder.

Mr. BLANTON. What has become of the gentleman's waste basket?

Mr. UNDERHILL. However, I do not criticize unless I have something constructive to offer, and in order that this occurrence, which has been such a stench in the nostrils of our people, should not occur again I have drawn up a bill which I propose to place in the basket at the conclusion of my address. It refers to section 53, chapter 1, title 31, of the Code of Laws of the United States, and provides that it be amended by inserting after the word "funds" in line 4 the following:

Including the expenditures of all special investigating committees of the House and Senate paid from the contingent funds of those bodies.

So that it will read:

The Comptroller General shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, including the expenditures of all special investigating committees of the House and Senate, paid from the contingent funds of those bodies.

It seems to me that this will meet the situation and meet with the approval of the House, and it should meet with the approval of the other legislative branch. There is at the present time, if I may be pardoned for repetition, no protection for the contingent fund when money is appropriated by either body for special investigating committees. It is true that they are supposed to submit vouchers and do submit vouchers to their chairmen, and in turn the chairman of each special committee is supposed to submit those vouchers, in the House at least, to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. What a position to put any Member of this body in—of having him audit the accounts of a colleague! It is not fair to the committee, and it is not fair to the chairman of the special committee, but it would be covered under this proposed law by a law which has passed Congress. It is a creature of their own. The law provides—

That the Comptroller General shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds * * *.

That was called into question some time ago, and the United States Supreme Court ruled in the following language:

No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All officers of the Government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and must obey it.

Now, if that is good, sound reasoning, and I submit it is, it seems to me that Members of this body who are appointed members of special investigating committees would be willing to subscribe to a law which they themselves have laid down for all Government officials.

I am not going into detail, but I just want to read two items from that law.

Subsistence allowance: Unless otherwise expressly provided in the employee's commission or appointment or by law, the official

authorized to issue travel orders may, at his option, authorize or order a per diem allowance, not to exceed \$7 per day, while traveling on official business within the limits of continental United States.

That is provision No. 1, and I do not see why any Member of Congress should object to living up to this law which they have laid down for the government of others.

The other one is section 10:

Indirect-route travel: In case a person travels by indirect route for his own personal convenience, the extra expense will be borne by himself, and reimbursement for expenses will be based only on such charges as were actually incurred, not to exceed what would have been incurred by the most economical and usual travel route.

There, again, I do not see why any Member of Congress should object to living up to that, being governed by the law he has laid down for others. In the House at least that law is rigidly observed, for the Committee on Accounts checks up every man's mileage and the distance between his place of residence and Washington and fixes his mileage according to the shortest routes between those two points. No complaint has ever come, so far as I know, from any Member of the House with regard to that procedure on the part of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, in order to emphasize what I have said I also want to emphasize how unobserved, not only by one committee but by other committees, these rules and regulations are. So in the brief time at my disposal I have drawn off a few of the inconsistencies contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29 in the report of a special investigating committee. I can give the pages and vouchers if any Member desires.

On page 3437 the railroad fare and Pullman, St. Paul to Washington, via Chicago, are \$26.27.

Then on page 3442 I find a similar item, "Railroad fare and Pullman, St. Paul to Washington, \$54.05," almost double the amount.

Then I find, on page 3441, transportation and Pullman charges, Washington to Chicago and return, for two, \$144.12.

On page 3441, the same page, another voucher, Chicago to Washington, including transportation, Pullman, meals, and portage, \$114.06. That is one way; almost as much as for the round trip in the other instance.

On page 3442, transportation, including Pullman, New York to Chicago and return, \$142.26. The other was with reference to Washington and Chicago. Here are a few items with reference to New York.

Transportation, including Pullman from Washington to New York and Wilmington, with a stop-over at Wilmington, and return, \$27.86.

Page 3448, transportation, including Pullman, Washington to New York and return, \$44.34.

Transportation, including Pullman, Washington to New York and return, \$41.80; another item of a similar amount, a difference of almost \$20 for transportation alone between those two points.

The railroad rate from Washington to New York or from New York to Washington is \$8.14 for the fare; seat fare in a Pullman, \$1.88 a day; a lower berth, \$3.75; a drawing-room, \$13.50; compartment, \$10.50. All but one of these items which I have mentioned are in excess of these published rates, and they are incidental of several other trips from various points.

For instance, from Boston, transportation and Pullman, Washington to Boston and return, \$73.33; transportation and Pullman, Washington to Boston, with stop-over at New York, \$53.85, a difference of \$20.

Transportation, including Pullman, Boston to Washington, \$22.93.

You see it is much cheaper to go from Boston to Washington than it is from Washington to Boston.

Then I find, on page 3445, transportation and Pullman for a member of the committee and assistants from Raleigh to Asheville, \$77.50.

Transportation and Pullman for another member from Asheville to Knoxville and Nashville, \$22.95.

To Andrew Jackson, transportation and Pullman for two members of the committee and assistants from Asheville to Memphis, \$135.30.

Transportation and Pullman for two members and assistants, a total of \$240.13.

Transportation furnished for three members of the committee, three tickets, Washington to Denver, at \$65.06 each; drawing room, Washington to Denver; a lower berth, Washington to Denver; a compartment, Chicago to Denver, and two tickets Chicago to Denver, totaling \$381.49. But here is an item and it caused me some trouble to find out just exactly the necessity for the expenditure. On October 13, transportation for 2 or 3 members of the committee, 10 tickets, Washington to Raleigh, \$102; 3 drawing rooms, Washington to Raleigh, \$40.50; 4 lower berths, Washington to Raleigh, \$15.

I was at a loss to know what brought this committee to Raleigh, N. C., where they made their headquarters, until I had pursued the record further and found that Raleigh was not far distant from a beautiful resort, Asheville, where they have some wonderful golf courses, beautiful mountains, and most hospitable people. When I found that I thought possibly I might have solved the situation. There was no reason, however, that there should be 10 tickets purchased for this trip to Raleigh when there were 7 people who traveled. Of course the explanation of that is there were 3 drawing rooms. You can find that by analyzing the expense account. There were 3 drawing rooms.

Why 3 drawing rooms for 3 members of the committee? It can only be explained by the fact that each member had a drawing room to himself. The rest of the royal suite had to take lower berths. But why these 3 individuals could not have occupied the same drawing room without contamination to any one of them—because they were 3 of a kind—I can not imagine. Surely these gentlemen were not distrustful of each other and they might have occupied the same drawing room at a very much reduced rate of expense to the taxpayers of the country.

I assume that these trips and the reports of the investigators were to determine what candidates were acceptable for membership in an exclusive men's club in Washington, which I will not name. Of course, no one with means sufficient to pay his own way could be considered favorably. I never would question the right of a constituency to elect a man to public office who had by thrift or good judgment accumulated a fortune, nor would I consider that the electorate who cast their votes for him were corruptionists who had sold themselves to the highest bidder, any more than I would question the intelligence of an electorate and designate them as morons if they voted for a candidate for public office who led the life of Riley at public expense.

Gentlemen, I can not emphasize the situation too strongly which has existed for at least the last two years.

Of course, the House and the Senate have the right to say whom they shall retain in their membership. If they can show anything corrupt, if they can show malfeasance in office, they have the right to expel a Member; but why they should come into my State or go into the State of North Carolina for the purpose of determining who shall be the nominees of the electorate of those States is beyond my comprehension, and I can not find any authorization whatever for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think that in fairness to the House he ought to explain whether any of this money, wastefully expended, as he thinks, came out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Well, if the gentleman will be patient enough I will get to that a little later on.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, did it?

Mr. UNDERHILL. No; it did not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the country ought to know it. Was there ever any such expenditure until the present Republican administration?

Mr. UNDERHILL. This is not a matter of party politics or partisanship. I have been in this House 10 years and I have never uttered a partisan word. I am here to attend to the public business. [Applause.]

Mr. DE PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Can the gentleman tell me why it was necessary on the 16th of August to go from Fargo to Coopers-town—that is, one member of the committee—and the Government pay for it?

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the Members will examine this report they will find that week-end trips were a common occurrence.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Also from Fargo to Glacier Park. There was no contest there, was there?

Mr. UNDERHILL. No.

Mr. DE PRIEST. At an expense to the Government of \$112.84.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I claim no one has the right to question what the people of a State may do, whether it be in North Carolina, Massachusetts, New York, or Illinois, as distinctly set forth in the Constitution. But some people believe themselves God's anointed, above and beyond the Constitution, and they repeat the famous utterance of the gentleman from New York (deceased) Tim Campbell, "What is the Constitution among friends?" It is time that this was called to the attention of the people of the country.

I want to say that this has come about largely through the assistance of certain men elected to high public office from certain States south of the Mason and Dixon line; that is, they have cooperated, for some reason or other, in encouraging political investigations and providing funds for these committees. I want to ask you people of the South how much you would enjoy the humiliation of the Federal Government coming into your State and telling you who you shall choose as your candidates for office. If any man from North Carolina or Alabama—yes, or from any other State south of the Mason and Dixon line—will tell me he has so far forgotten the teachings of his fathers as to subscribe to any such proposition as that, I will agree not to put in my resolution.

But they will not do it. If you reserve that privilege to yourselves, why should you not give it to us in the North, and why should you assist those who would destroy the right which the Constitution gives each State to choose its own candidates? I warn you. Take care, lest this annoyance and injustice be visited upon you and come back to plague you to a greater degree than in any other section of the country.

They say I made an error when I stated there was a \$50 taxicab fee for one day in Boston. I was not in error at all. It is a fact and I will give you the facts. I was in Boston at the time a trip was made to Boston by a member of this investigating committee, and the member was there in the capacity of an investigator for the committee.

He took this occasion to fill a speaking engagement at the Hotel Statler before the National Convention of the American Federation of Labor, and the entire expense of \$127 for his twofold mission was charged up to the committee. I do not know about the rest of you, but, usually, when I am asked by an organization to deliver an address away from my own district, they are always courteous and liberal enough to offer to pay my expenses, and sometimes they exaggerate my abilities as an entertainer by offering me an honorarium.

The member of the committee left the very next night. He came there in the evening of one day and left the following night.

This was the first visit he had ever made to Boston, rich with historic places of interest, and he took occasion to visit these shrines of patriotic Americans. Well, it was worth the money to have him educated about the history of Massachusetts. [Laughter and applause.] But during his brief stay in the city in an investigating capacity, how much time did this leave him to discuss with the "star" investigator, Western Starr, the alleged corruption existing in Massachusetts in the election of a United States Senator?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. COLE. For the benefit of my friend from Texas, will the gentleman say whether this gentleman is a Republican or a Democrat?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That would be just as bad as answering his question. I am not partisan in this matter at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman permit one question that is not partisan?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Well, go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows I am with him against extravagance, no matter whether it is by a Republican or a Democrat, but I was wondering if the gentleman from Massachusetts, who watches these things closely, has compared these extravagant expenses with the expenses, for instance, of the Joe Walsh investigating committee out on the California coast or the Graham of Illinois investigating committee, that took place and were paid for from the House contingent fund, where over \$100,000 at a whack was handed out.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I was not a Member of this body when the investigations to which the gentleman refers took place. I am not responsible for what occurred in the past. If the gentleman was a Member of this body at that time, it was up to him to do about as I am trying to do now—bring about a reform. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. But it does no good. It does not stop the extravagance.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentlemen on this side of the House, including the gentleman from Texas, will give proper support to this resolution of mine, it will do good. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I will support the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman before he completes his very interesting address give the House the benefit of his views upon the point, whether in the absence of a Federal statute regulating the conduct of primary elections—if, indeed, any such statute in view of the Newberry decision could be passed as long as the Constitution is what it is—there is any legal warrant for these investigations into primary elections?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not any warrant in the world except the warrant of autocratic usurpation of the rights of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. BECK. If I may further interrupt my friend, what possible distinction can be drawn between a committee appointed without any authority of law to investigate a question that is beyond the competence of the Federal Government, as declared by the Supreme Court in the Newberry decision, and the Court of the Star Chamber in England, which remains an offense to all who love the political traditions of the English-speaking race?

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a student and an expounder of the Constitution second to none in this country and, so far as I know, in any other country, but the gentleman will not go any farther than I will in his indignation at the unwarranted interference with State affairs which has recently taken place in another body of this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. DE PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. DE PRIEST. I see here an item of \$50.90 for tips spent in Illinois.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I thank the gentleman, but those items are so insignificant in comparison with some of the others that I have not even made a record of them.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Answering the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is there not a difference between the Star Chamber of England and this committee in that the Star Chamber in England had a constitutional basis at that time, while this committee has no basis at all constitutionally?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Absolutely none.

Now, gentlemen, coming back, really, to the meat of the matter, we could take this report item by item and we could find inconsistency after inconsistency and error after error, but it would get us nowhere. It would only prove there was carelessness or recklessness somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. May I ask the gentleman for five more minutes?

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. That would get us nowhere, but there is a duly constituted and authorized subdivision of this Government whose duty it is to look into these expenditures, not because they may be dishonest, but in order to make them equitable, fair, and just to everybody.

There is a law on the statute books passed by Congress itself which places a limitation on every officer of the Government from the President down. Even the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, all the rest of the Cabinet are amenable to its provisions. Why should Congress, why should any individual object to the transaction of public business under the same limitation exactly? So, in order to relieve the committees of the House and the Senate of embarrassment and the intolerable situation which would come if these committees should attempt to audit the accounts of their colleagues, I have placed in this bill in the hands of the duly constituted authority the power to audit the accounts of all special investigating committees.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. COYLE. I understand the gentleman's embarrassment which he probably feels in having to call to the attention of the House that it should be taken off his shoulders, and yet in his administration of the Committee on Accounts there has been no Member of this body who has failed to go along and pay up his accounts as requested by the committee. That I believe is true.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Oh, the Members of the House have been so kind to me that I am almost moved to tears. I am a member of the "grouch committee," but in spite of all I have done to excite animosity and the antagonism of my colleagues, I know of no Member on either side of the House that I can not call my friend. [Applause.]

Mr. COYLE. Does the gentleman recollect some former Member of Congress who has not paid—

Mr. UNDERHILL. I did inherit one account and I am thankful to say that it is the only one, of \$500 from a previous Member of this House for sending telegrams which were not of an official nature. I have tried my best to collect this bill, I have threatened to insert in the Record the telegrams themselves, and if I thought I should get the money which would help to pay for the printing of several pages of the Record to show up this man, I should be tempted to do so. But what is the use? That is past and gone. Let us look forward to the future.

Now, this is not going to affect any Member of the House or the Senate in relation to stationery, material for folding, folding documents, furniture and repairs, stenographic report of committee hearings, telegraph and telephone service, Speaker's automobile, Capitol police, packing boxes, stationery, commutation for Members, expense for Members' funerals, or expense of employees' funerals, all of which are paid out of the contingent fund. But it does apply in every instance where there is a special committee appointed to investigate something that exists or is a will-o'-the-wisp and does not exist—it will control them and serve, I believe, to the appointment of fewer of these investigating committees that are so expensive.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Before the gentleman closes I hope he will state to the House the justification for the creation by the House, and which I think the gentleman

voted for, the resolution that resulted in what was known as the Lehlbach investigating committee? The gentleman criticizes another body for creating committees of this character. How about the House investigating committee?

Mr. UNDERHILL. If my recollection is correct, the Committee on Accounts reported out—I have forgotten the exact amount—for the Lehlbach committee, and if my recollection serves, they have not used a penny.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman has not answered. I want to know the justification for the appointment of the House committee. If the Senate was not justified in appointing a committee of this character, then neither was the House.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I want to say to the gentleman that time and again the gentleman from Massachusetts has expressed his opinion in as strong language as he knew how that these investigation committees led nowhere and accomplished nothing. [Applause.]

The regular standing committees of Congress in the regular performance of their duties should take care of the business of this country rather than to delegate their powers and duties to some special investigating committee, with resulting expense and scandal. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I have received, from some of my constituents who are veterans of the Great War and who have held high offices in the Legion posts, a copy of a telegram which they have, collectively, sent to Mr. Ralph T. O'Neil, national commander of the American Legion, at Indianapolis.

I desire to call the attention of the House to this telegram because I feel confident that it represents the opinion of a great many thoughtful and patriotic veterans of the war and members of the American Legion. These gentlemen perceive that what is bad for the country can not, in the end, be good for the veterans themselves. The telegram is as follows:

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., February 3, 1931.

RALPH T. O'NEIL,
National Commander American Legion,
Indianapolis, Ind.

At a time when business is especially sensitive to even a suggestion of further drains on the Government Treasury many of us feel that any activity for further bonus legislation is not only a tactical error of the first magnitude but a betrayal of the Legion's pledge to serve in time of peace and its specific pledge to Congress at the time adjusted compensation was enacted. Particularly in view of the action of the last convention, we suggest also that the national committee is taking a grave and unwarranted responsibility in sponsoring legislation which all impartial observers agree can only result in further hardship to the entire country, including the veterans themselves.

V. L. KEATING,
W. P. SEELEY,
Past Commanders Post No. 11.
P. C. CALHOUN,
Past Commander Connecticut.
Vice Chairman St. Louis Caucus.
E. L. KELLY,
Past Commander Connecticut.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the prevailing currents in this vicinity in the last few days having been rather harsh and acrimonious, I am going to appeal to the gods of the winds to bring into this Chamber some gentle breezes of praise. I am going to take up a few minutes of your time to tell you about some of the good things that men do in this world—some of the good things, forsooth, that even Government employees do.

It has been said that kings and potentates, princes and lords are ungrateful, but that the greatest ingrate of all is King Demos. Vox populi is not always vox dei, or, if it is, it takes strange and mysterious ways to manifest itself. Hence it is said that Republics are ungrateful. In confirmation of this I intend to call your attention to some striking instances which were first brought to our notice during the hearings of the Appropriations Committee. In many of the bureaus of our Government, for example, the Coast and

Geodetic Service, the Bureau of Standards, and the Public Health Service, it is amazing to learn the extent of the splendid work that is done by zealous, devoted scientists, who, day by day, delve into the mysteries of the arts and sciences and bring forth inventions not only of great moment to the world but of financial advantage to the Nation which employs them.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

One of the outstanding achievements in the Bureau of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which, by the way, was established by Thomas Jefferson, and the connection of that you will see later, was the tide-calculating machine, an instrument whereby an ordinary high-school graduate can sit at the instrument and, by pulling a lever, indicate upon a chart day by day, hour by hour the tide, high and low, of any place in this wide world from the beginning to the end of time. This instrument is a combination of wheels, disks, cogs, and pinions, and other mechanism, so finely and delicately adjusted that it performs the most abstruse mathematical calculations. It is one of man's finest achievements and visitors from all parts of the world come yearly to Washington to look at it. Every Member of Congress who takes pride in American scientific progress should do himself the justice of going to the Coast and Geodetic Survey and looking at the instrument itself in operation.

This instrument was devised and built by three men after an arduous labor of 15 years, beginning in 1895. Dr. Rollin A. Harris, who died on January 20, 1918, was the man who devised the scientific formula. At the time of his death he was drawing a salary of \$2,400 a year. Then came Mr. Ernest G. Fisher, a mechanical engineer, who embodied the scientific formula into the mechanical device. He was at the time drawing \$1,800 a year. Mr. Fisher was retired in 1921 on a retirement allowance of \$750 a year. They were assisted in this great work by Leland P. Shidy, still in the service, drawing to-day \$2,400 a year.

What does this marvelous instrument do? It takes the place of 70 mathematicians who would otherwise be employed in making these abstruse calculations, and it saves the Government of the United States \$150,000 a year. In the 20 years that it has been in operation it has saved this Government of ours \$3,000,000. Did these men receive any medal or award or recognition of any kind? If they were in Europe they would have been decorated with badges and ribbons and sashes and would have been heaped with honors. We have never given them even a word of recognition. It is up to the men and women of this House to answer the question as to whether Republics are ungrateful.

ORIGIN OF THE MEDAL-OF-HONOR IDEA

That was the stimulus that induced me in 1924 to make a speech on the floor of this House in which I described this instrument, calling it "brass brains." On the occasion I challenged the membership of this House to take up the question of rewarding earnest, zealous, devoted employees, and accord to them some recognition such as other countries so willingly bestow for scientific achievements. Being on the minority side of the House, I hesitated to take the initiative and, though I coveted the satisfaction of doing so worthy an act, I felt that the cause I espoused might make better progress if the move were made from the other side of the aisle.

There being no response, in 1925 I introduced a bill. I introduced it again in the next session of Congress, in 1927. In the meantime something came up in debate upon the floor of this House on the War Department bill (February 2, 1928). It was revealed that a certain master sergeant in the Artillery had devised a special cable whereby the firing control of the artillery could be regulated. This cable has been adopted by the Government and saves the United States \$100,000 a year in maintenance. When that was brought up on the floor of the House, my friend and colleague and old associate, Colonel WAINWRIGHT, addressed some questions to our colleague from California, Mr. BARBOUR, who was in charge of the bill, and expressed the opinion that something should be done for these devoted men who, working for a mere pittance, used their spare time

to evolve something for the benefit of their country and of mankind.

Then following that came the death of some of our men in the Public Health Service, who submitted themselves to the germs of diseases, incurring fatal maladies—yellow fever and typhoid fever—and died, thus making voluntary sacrifices of their lives. Then some striking instances of courage and self-sacrifice came before the House in the bill to accord to the captains of the *Roosevelt* and the *Harding* the thanks of Congress for gallant rescues at sea. These events prompted the introduction of a bill, H. R. 13036, by my friend, Colonel WAINWRIGHT, providing for medals of honor and honoraria to men who had sacrificed their lives or risked their lives outside of the ordinary risks of duty.

The object of both of these bills, although they touch on different kinds of achievement, was such that the chairman of the Committee on the Library, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], called a hearing, which brought out some very interesting facts. As a result of that hearing the National Academy of Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Research Council collaborated and incorporated the ideas of both bills in the bill (H. R. 12922) which is before the House to-day and is now on the Consent Calendar.¹

AIM OF THE BILL

The bill as finally drafted provides for two medals of honor: The Thomas Jefferson medal of honor, to be awarded "to scientific workers who, while in the employ of the Federal Government, have made outstanding contributions to the advancement of scientific knowledge or the application of its truths in a practical way for the welfare of the human race."

The other is called the Jesse W. Lazear medal of honor, "to be awarded to citizens who, while in the employ of the Federal Government, have rendered conspicuous service to humanity at the voluntary risk of life or health over and above the ordinary risks of duty."

The name "Lazear" is attached to the last-named medal because this famous surgeon, while in the United States Army of Occupation in Cuba, voluntarily allowed himself to be infected with the yellow-fever germ in order to study the progress of the disease. His researches led to the segregation of the germ of that dreadful malady and were the foundation of effectual methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment.

I will refer later to the many things that have been accomplished by these earnest workers in the Public Health Service.

In the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in addition to the tide-calculating machine, we have the wire-drag device, developed by Commander N. H. Heck, with the result that in 1929, for the first time since the settlement of that territory, there were no wrecks on the Alaskan shore, and that was reflected in the savings on ship insurance rates, one company alone having reported a saving of \$22,000 a year on their particular line of steamers.

Then there is the fathometer, for sounding the depths of the ocean. That instrument was devised by this bureau and it has saved thousands of dollars. Just hear what the late lamented Col. E. Lester Jones, then the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, told the Library Committee of the House at that hearing:

I could elaborate many times on these things and not tell you the same story of what it has all meant. Here is echo sounding. We have been tied up for months on the west coast with our big ships. Most of our work is at sea, 85 per cent of it. We have been tied up for months due to fog. Fog is no terror any more. Why? Because we have developed, largely through this same officer, Commander N. H. Heck, with the help of the Bureau of Standards, this echo sounding, which through a system of waves we send through a radio station on shore. If I may have a minute, I would like to describe that.

What is the result of this invention? Modern ships. I see within two or three years the most modern up-to-date charts of that great Pacific coast, all the result of the two things. This invention, and the fact that we have been generously dealt with

¹ Passed in the House Feb. 21, 1931.

by Congress in acquiring new vessels and other equipment that, of course, is obviously necessary. Now people say, "What have you saved?" Well, it is thousands and thousands of dollars. In the first place, it has speeded up our work a half century in many ways, but that is not all. The Pacific coast doesn't have any more wrecks and strandings like they did seven or eight years ago.

COL. E. LESTER JONES

I want to say, speaking of the late Col. E. Lester Jones, he was one of our most painstaking and efficient officials. It is believed by many of his friends that he actually shortened his life by his devotion to duty. He took a sincere interest in this idea of medals of honor for scientific workers and helped me materially in the drawing of the original bill.

At the hearing on this bill some objection was made to the proposal to recognize merit of this character by the suggestion that an employee of the Government ought to do his best irrespective of honors or rewards and that that is what he is paid for. This was the colonel's answer:

Now, you said, Mr. Chairman, and very properly, that it is a man's duty to the Government to do his best. It is; he should do it. And if he doesn't do it, he is not doing his duty. But it has been my observation that the man who quits at 4.30, goes home free from responsibility and gets to his office just at 9, under the wire, is not the man who does these things. There are those men in the Government, but there are a lot of men, which nobody knows better than I do, that work far into the night, weeks and months and years. Otherwise they never could hope to bring about what we have such conspicuous examples of.

Now, you take the man who goes to war. He is expected to be brave and do his full duty as a soldier. Then comes the next step. Why does he get the congressional medal or the distinguished-service cross? Because he has shown himself to be exceptionally brave and has done something beyond the ordinary calls of duty. I think the cases are analogous. I think they are much the same. You take Mr. Fisher's case—he did most of his work at nighttime over 15 years, and while I have never asked him, from intimations and my intimate knowledge of the man, and being associated with him for 10 years before he retired, 10 o'clock at night was nothing, or 12 o'clock. All his time that he could possibly spare from his sleep was given to this work.

Therefore, my own conclusion is that any man in the Government service who is devoting his life away beyond the ordinary calls required of him in the law is performing an identical service, in so far as giving more than is ordinarily expected of him, as the man at the front who sees a poor comrade a kilometer ahead, or comrades in danger, and that runs up there in the face of bullets and helps them to safety, or tries to do anything to relieve them.

I don't know whether I make myself clear; but I think in private life we can do things that we are not expected to do, and these men, such as I have spoken of, are examples of many men that I know who sacrifice health and a good deal of pleasure in order to give something that perhaps the Almighty has been so good as to allot to him and of which he takes advantage.

And this was Chairman Luce's reply:

THE CHAIRMAN. I think we understand that. We have very recently had a notable illustration of it in the comparative degree of attention given by the press of the country to the death of Bennett, the aviator, and to Mr. Madden, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Bennett had the front page and full pages and sometimes several pages, while Mr. Madden's demise was noted only casually. Undoubtedly, Mr. Madden had rendered much more public service than the other man. Bennett's was a case of the heroic adventurer. I wonder if we will ever be able to induce the world to appraise these things in what we might recognize, philosophically, to be the right proportion. I don't say this in any way as demurring at the proposal. I say that in my own reflections I have despaired of reforming human nature in this particular.

I might also say in passing that it was Colonel Jones who suggested that the medal be called the Thomas Jefferson medal as a tribute to that statesman's scientific achievements—a side of his character which is very little known.

MR. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. GRIFFIN. I yield.

MR. SLOAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying, and I think well of these insignia, medals, and badges, but does the bill to which the gentleman refers make any appropriation for lining the purses or increasing the bank accounts of those men who have devoted their lives to the country with such good effect?

MR. GRIFFIN. That is a very pertinent question, and the bill as I first drew it provided for an honorarium consisting of an annuity of from \$100 to \$500 a year, so as to eke out their meager salaries, but the Committee on the Library

changed that feature of the bill so as to provide a single honorarium of \$1,000 to go with the medal and certificate of honor.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Then in the Bureau of Standards we find Dr. Lyman J. Briggs and Paul R. Hyle devised the earth-inductor compass, by which Lindbergh was able to make his splendid solo flight to Europe, and which is now in general use throughout the flying world.

Another device of the Bureau of Standards is the radio-direction finder. This has been said to have created a new era in safety at sea. In the hearings there is a summary of these.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

So far I have discussed only the achievements in pure physical science of these bureaus of the Government. I must not fail to direct your attention to the splendid record of the Public Health Service and the achievements of the men and women in that branch in medicine, biology, and sanitation.

Dr. Joseph Goldberger found the cause and cure of pellagra. Dr. R. R. Spencer similarly investigated with equal success the origin and cure of Rocky Mountain fever.

Dr. John McMullen made similar researches in connection with trachoma, and a lady—and this will be of interest to the lady Members of our House—Bacteriologist Alice Evans made a study of Malta fever, incurring the disease herself, with the result that she is disabled for life.

A number of surgeons died by contracting yellow fever. Waldo, Glazier, Groenvelt, Branham, McAdam, and Wrightman are six names that ought to stand high in the temple of fame; men who voluntarily, beyond the risks of duty, injected themselves with a fatal disease in order to extend the bounds of science, to open up to the world a knowledge of the causes of disease, and who perished with a fortitude equal to that of any man who carried a gun in the trenches or advanced over no man's land. [Applause.]

OUR GOVERNMENT ALONE IN THIS NEGLECT

Our Government is alone in neglecting the achievements of these men and women. Great Britain has the victory medal of the Royal Geographical Society, and she is not selfish about bestowing it, either.

They have awarded that medal not only to their own people but they have awarded it to Americans. It was awarded in 1910 to Commodore Peary, who discovered the North Pole; in 1914, to Alexander Hamilton Rice, a noted American geographer; and in 1924 it was awarded to Director John F. Hayford, head of the College of Engineering of the Northwestern University.

In conclusion let me say there is not the faintest glimmer of self-interest behind this bill. It is purely humanitarian. Its purpose is to give tangible evidence to posterity and to the world that Republics are not ungrateful.

One of the happiest revelations of my life was the discovery that in the hidden recesses of our Government bureaus there is a class of unselfish and devoted men and women who have not only done their appointed tasks faithfully and well, but who, over and above the requirements of duty, have rendered signal services to science—making original researches, discoveries, and inventions that are really outstanding achievements in the progress of the world. Also, that there were numbers of unselfish men and women who have risked, and even sacrificed, their lives in the advancement of knowledge and for the health and happiness of mankind.

These are no seekers after wealth—except that wealth that lies buried in the bosom of nature and which can only be attained by the utmost sacrifice of time, of health, and even of life itself.

How shall we express our gratitude? We boast of their achievements and of our advances in science, and yet year after year Congress fails to act. Yes, let us take it to ourselves because, after all, these gifts and these honors must come from this House of Representatives of the people. Shall we allow their names to go down to obscurity, un-

known, unacknowledged, and unrewarded? Shall we selfishly reap the reward of their devotion and give no thought to the sacrifices they have made? No man with red blood in his veins would be willing to accept the result of their efforts, take pride in their achievements, and yet stand idly by and not raise a hand to help them in life or begrudge them the praise to carry on their names to posterity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting some extracts from the hearings on this matter and some letters, I insert the following:

I

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE INTERIM COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, MARCH 13, 1930

Moved: That the National Research Council is in favor of recommending to Congress a bill providing for medals of honor and awards to Government employees for distinguished service in science.

Adopted.

Moved: That the National Research Council is also in favor of recommending to Congress a bill providing for medals of honor and awards to Government employees for conspicuous service to humanity at the voluntary risk of life or health.

Adopted.

II

[Extract from hearing on medal of honor bill]

WHY THE MEDAL MIGHT WELL BE GIVEN THE NAME "THE JEFFERSON MEDAL"

THOMAS JEFFERSON—HIS SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS

By the late Col. E. Lester Jones

Jefferson stands out as a many-sided man with the best education that his time afforded and of great intellectual attainments.

The son of a civil engineer, he naturally was brought up in an environment in his home which was sympathetic to science. Engineering, as is well known, is merely applied science. Much is known of Jefferson's interest in various scientific matters, especially in botany and geology.

He experimented enthusiastically on his estate in Virginia in varieties and rotation of crops and he kept meteorological tables with diligence. For eight years he tabulated, with accuracy, the earliest and latest appearance of 37 vegetables in the Washington market. When abroad as ambassador and on other missions for our Government he sought out varieties of grasses, trees, rice, and olives for American experiment.

He managed to make practical use of his mathematics about his farms and seemed to have been remarkably apt in the practical application of mechanical principles.

It has been said that Jefferson carried with him, from the college of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, a familiarity with the higher mathematics and natural sciences only possessed at his age by men who have a rare natural taste and ability for those studies. He remained an ardent student throughout his life.

As a member of the Virginia Legislature in 1776 he strongly advocated the establishment of a system of general education. During the last years of Jefferson's life he devoted himself to the establishment of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville near his home. He planned the buildings, gathered its faculty, and shaped its organization. Practically all the great ideals and aims of administration and curriculum that dominated American universities at the end of the nineteenth century were anticipated by him. His educational plans had been maturing in his mind since 1776.

Jefferson was the first American statesman to make education by the State a fundamental article of democratic faith.

Jefferson's scientific attainments resulted in his seeing clearly the problem involved in making surveys of our country and of coastal waters. He searched the world for a man to organize the Coast Survey along sound lines. The man selected by him was Ferdinand Hassler, a Swiss engineer and geodesist, who, at the time, was a professor of mathematics at the Military School at West Point, N. Y. It was rather remarkable that the plan outlined by Hassler, approved by Jefferson, for the Coast Survey has needed practically no fundamental change in the past 109 years since the first Coast Survey work by our Government was done. Hassler was, of course, a great man, but he could not have made his plans effective without the thorough understanding of their value shown by Jefferson. The oldest scientific organization of the United States Government is thus a living and perpetual monument to the foresight and scientific ability and attainments of Thomas Jefferson.

In view of Jefferson's great interest in science, more than 100 years ago, it would be most fitting if a medal, known as the Jefferson medal, could be given from time to time to those Americans who have advanced the welfare of humanity by their scientific researches or by the application of scientific principles to the welfare of man.

In one of his letters Jefferson said, "And I am for encouraging the progress of science in all its branches and not for raising a hue and cry against the sacred name of philosophy." In another letter, speaking of the University of Virginia and the plans for its organization, he stated, in part:

"The first step is to obtain a good plan; that is, a judicious collection of the sciences and a practicable grouping of them together. * * * I will venture to sketch the sciences which seem useful and practicable for us as they occur to me while holding my pen—botany, chemistry, zoology, anatomy, surgery, medicine, natural philosophy, agriculture, mathematics, astronomy, geology, geography, politics, commerce, history, ethics, law, arts, fine arts. This list is imperfect, because I made it hastily and because I am unequal to the subject. It is evident that some of these articles are too much for one professor and must therefore be ramified. Others may be ascribed in groups to a single professor."

In another letter, written concerning the University of Virginia after it had been established, he said, "That institution is now qualified to raise its youth to an order of science unequalled in any other State." In the same letter were these words, "Those now on the theater of affairs will enjoy the ineffable happiness of seeing themselves succeeded by sons of a grade of science beyond their own ken."

An author of the *Life and Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, in speaking of his later years, has this to say:

"His interest in literary and scientific matters seemed to take on new life, but the very leisure which enabled him to cultivate them brought its own cessation. His scientific tastes had made him known to every learned body in Europe and America and he was a member of most of them. He was especially enthusiastic for the success of the American Philosophic Society, of which he was twice elected president during his retirement."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. [Applause.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, another chapter, a dark one too, has been written in the astounding and outrageously black record of the post-office-lease situation. Fittingly enough, it has its setting in St. Paul, where the whole iniquitous leasing story had its origin. The Post Office Department has just announced a wholesale demotion of department heads in the St. Paul post office, allegedly in the interest of the service. Specific inquiry has elicited the information that these demoted officials have suddenly, without warning and in violation of postal regulations, been reduced drastically in grade and pay for "failure to cooperate" and "lack of loyalty." And the charges are true. These honest, efficient, intelligent officials, with long years of satisfactory service have failed to cooperate and were disloyal. Their crimes consisted of failure to cooperate in soliciting and boosting the private insurance business of the postmaster at St. Paul, Charles J. Moos. They failed to cooperate by refusing to violate postal regulations in engaging in politics. They declined to circulate petitions demanding the reappointment of the postmaster. They declined to tell all of their post-office clientele that Mr. Moos was the greatest postmaster in the country. They declined to perjure themselves by swearing that the postmaster spent eight hours a day in post-office work, when it is common knowledge that he spends but a fraction of the time required in Government service and the far greater part of his time in his private business.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. YON. Is this postmaster still in office?

Mr. MAAS. Yes. He is still the postmaster at St. Paul without appointment. His term expired long ago, but he is being held in office for some unaccountable reason.

Mr. YON. Is he a friend of the Postmaster General?

Mr. MAAS. Well, they seem to have very similar attitudes. These things they were ordered to do by the postmaster, and because they failed to do so they are demoted for "failure to cooperate," though there has never been one word in complaint of their intelligent, efficient postal service. So, too, they were disloyal. To whom, however, were they disloyal? To the Government? To the Post Office Department? To their work? To the public? No. But they were disloyal to the postmaster because they told the truth about the infamous 20-year noncancelable lease and the postmaster's connection with it. A lease that was robbing the people of upwards of a hundred thousand dollars a year in excess rentals. A lease that permitted the owners of the station to unload upon the public over a million dollars' worth of bonds on a property awarded a value of \$334,000 by a Federal court in condemnation—a most generous and liberal award, made so incidentally largely because of sympathy for the bondholders rather than as real value of the property.

Mr. Moos was postmaster throughout the whole sordid transaction. Although in no way connected with the original negotiations to lease the property, he became postmaster before the building was completed, and had an opportunity to know what a steal it was against the Government. Yet it was under his administration that the Post Office Department moved in and the lease was signed calling for \$120,775 per year for 20 years. There is doubt whether the building ever cost \$200,000. The original contract was for \$76,000 and there were extras, though probably not much more than doubling that. This contract was cancelable by the Government. Later it was made noncancelable. At least one of the at-present demoted officials repeatedly pleaded with Mr. Moos, the postmaster, during the negotiations to get the Government to surrender its cancellation clause to block the making of the lease noncancelable.

But Mr. Moos turned a deaf ear to all such entreaties. The enterprising postmaster went to Chicago "on official business" at Government expense and visited the office of the owner of the station. There he solicited and received the insurance for his firm on this property. Nor were they pikers. Remember, a Federal court has since placed a total valuation on the building, land, and value of the lease of \$334,000. It is interesting to note, in the light of this fact, the amount of insurance placed with Mr. Moos's insurance firm, the William B. Joyce & Co., of which he is the active vice president. The record in 1928 is as follows:

Fire insurance	\$500,000
Tornado insurance	330,000
Explosion	250,000
Fire rental	120,000

Also plate-glass, steam-boiler, and elevator liability.

But Mr. Moos, the postmaster and enterprising insurance agent, did not stop at this. A very similar transaction took place in connection with the leasing of the postal garage facilities at St. Paul. A garage, built for the Government by men who happened to be connected with an insurance agency of their own, proved unsatisfactory to the postmaster; and since the lease could be canceled by the Post Office Department, it was canceled on the recommendation of the postmaster and a new building put up by men who did not have any insurance connections; at least the new owners, after getting a noncancelable lease, gave Mr. Moos their insurance. This new garage was conveniently built large enough to house free a number of private cars of business acquaintances who were good customers of Mr. Moos's insurance firm.

Mr. Moos is such an obliging postmaster that he has the post-office trucks pick up the parcel post and take it to the post office for a favored few of the business houses—that is, business houses who patronize his insurance firm.

The sure road to promotion in the St. Paul post office is to boost Mr. Moos as the greatest postmaster in the country and to boost his insurance business. And woe be it unto the unfaithful who fail to do so. They are demoted, and the faithful boosters and solicitors are promoted, as in the present case.

Because all of these facts became known before Mr. Moos's term as postmaster expired in January, 1930, I refused to recommend his reappointment. But the Postmaster General was very much impressed with this St. Paul postmaster and refused to replace him. This is not difficult to understand, however, in the light of the subsequent actions and attitude of the Postmaster General. Their ideas seem to coincide to a remarkable degree.

Receiving protests from substantial business men in St. Paul against Mr. Moos's reappointment, protests in writing against his unethical use of his official position as postmaster to further his private business, I filed these formal charges with the Postmaster General. An investigation was made and, though the charges were substantiated, in each case they were forgiven, excused, or condoned. Then a most remarkable thing happened. In a public announcement stating that the investigation had completely exonerated Mr. Moos, the Postmaster General went so far as to praise him

for his "fine concept of his public duty." Nor is this strange in view of the Postmaster General's apparent similar attitude on the same subject.

To my written request and later repeated challenges to make the report of the investigation public, the Postmaster General has answered not at all. I am willing to have Congress and the public judge from the facts. I am informed that the department's explanation of their failure to make the investigation public is that the file disappeared, including the documentary evidence that I submitted and requested to have returned to me.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. As a Member of Congress, the gentleman has the right to go down to that department, demand that file, and investigate it himself. Why does not the gentleman do that?

Mr. MAAS. They say the file has disappeared.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman could go down there and make them find that file for him.

Mr. MAAS. Frankly, I do not believe that any such thing happened. Since that time I have made repeated requests that an examination be held for the selection of a new postmaster at St. Paul, and have expressed my willingness to abide by that examination. I can not get even a reply from the Postmaster General to my letters requesting such examination. Failing this, I have demanded that either an examination be called or that the name of Mr. Moos, who is still in office, without reappointment, be sent to the Senate, so that the facts can be aired there.

Why is this not done? Why has this man been held in office over a year after his term expired without having his name submitted properly to the Senate? Is the Postmaster General afraid he will not be confirmed and that he will have to declare the office vacant and appoint a new postmaster for St. Paul? Surely if my charges are groundless, and investigation discloses a complete disapproval of these charges and results in a sweeping exoneration of Mr. Moos, then certainly Mr. Moos is entitled to the benefit of being vindicated by the United States Senate. Both Mr. Moos and Mr. Brown should not only welcome such a show-down but they should be the first to demand it.

If the postmaster at St. Paul had any pride and self-respect, he would refuse to stay in office month after month, now well over a year, with this cloud hanging over him without insisting on a complete public hearing of his case. The United States Senate is the proper place for such a hearing. The very Constitution, in fact, makes it mandatory. But the Constitution seems to mean nothing to the Postmaster General. The law fixes the term of a postmaster at four years and the Senate confirms him for four years. The Postmaster General has made the St. Paul postmaster's term over five years already without reference to the law or to the Senate.

Why is this man Moos held in office under these circumstances? Why does the administration not replace him or why does the administration not submit his name to the Senate? Can it be that they are afraid of Mr. Moos? Are they afraid of something he knows? What is being concealed? Who is being protected? I do not ask these as rhetorical questions to cast insidious insinuations on anyone. I ask them so that you may think about them, for in due time I shall also answer them.

In the meantime I demand that the matter be disposed of. I have made certain charges. Since it is impossible to get an honest consideration of these charges under the present post-office administration, I insist that the public get the facts through Congress, either by having Mr. Moos's name submitted to the Senate for reappointment or by an investigation by a committee of the House. I not only welcome an impartial investigation, I demand it. Mr. Moos should do the same. I shall insist that Mr. Moos's name be sent to the Senate or that the administration make an explanation as to why this man is being held in office now over a year without appointment or authority of law.

This last damnable outrage of unwarranted demotions for political reasons of faithful public servants by a faithless public official is indecent, unfair, and infamous. The postmaster at St. Paul has used his official public office to promote his own private business, the most dangerous political abuse possible in a republic. Such betrayal of public trust is a threat to the governmental integrity of a free democracy.

An administration that countenances such actions surely forfeits the confidence and respect of the public.

Adding to that the punishing of honest and efficient public servants through demotion and giving their places to puppets who do the postmaster's bidding, without regard to postal laws, rules, and regulations, is the last straw.

These men who have devoted the best part of their lives to building up an efficient postal service for St. Paul are suddenly and drastically demoted at the instigation of the postmaster at St. Paul, which action is concurred in by the department at Washington, and this without warning or even a hearing of any sort, though this is supposed to be guaranteed them by civil service law.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The worst indictment I find against Postmaster General Brown is that he is absolutely doing away with all civil service rules and requirements. For instance, when an examination is held in my State and three eligibles are put on the list, if one happens to be a Democrat and stands at the top and the other two for some reason can not be appointed they hold another examination until they get a Republican on the list. When they have three or four taking the examination and the only one who passes it is a Democrat and he is high up on the list and the other two do not pass, instead of appointing the Democrat they discard that examination and after a while hold another, until they get an eligible Republican to appoint.

Mr. MAAS. Does not the gentleman think this House ought to investigate these charges of a violation of the civil service law?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. To a certain extent, I believe in the political doctrine that "to the victor belongs the spoils," and if I were a Democratic Postmaster General and I had a chance to give an appointment to a Democrat who was equally qualified with a Republican I would exercise my right and give it to a Democrat, but I would not disregard altogether all civil service rules.

Mr. MAAS. I ask this House to investigate the wholesale violation of section 6 of Postal Laws and Regulations as approved August 24, 1912, which requires that charges be filed and a hearing granted before reducing any employee in the classified civil-service list.

Apparently their own Postal Laws and Regulations mean no more to the present administration of the Post Office Department than the Federal Constitution does.

If the law were complied with and charges properly and honestly filed against these employees, this is how they would have to read:

First. Failure to cooperate. These employees refused to proclaim Mr. Moos the most wonderful postal administrator in the country. This, in spite of the fact that those who are acquainted with the facts know that few if any ideas for the practical betterment of the Postal Service have ever emanated from his mind. He does, however, for publicity's sake appropriate to himself the full credit for every good idea advanced by subordinates.

Second. These employees frustrated the postmaster's efforts to gain personal benefit at public expense. As an example of this, Mr. Moos proposed to close an important downtown finance station in the Pioneer Building and move it into the basement of the William B. Joyce & Co. building, which is owned by his insurance firm. When the assistant postmaster forced the abandonment of the plan he was severely

reprimanded for depriving the postmaster personally of the rent that he would have received from the move.

Third. Further proof of lack of cooperation. Rendering established service to firms—to the advantage of the Postal Service—when the postmaster desired the service withheld until he had forced such concerns to place their insurance with his firm.

Fourth. Disloyalty in opposing the postmaster's policy of establishing a considerable number of independent finance stations, in advance of public demand or requirement for such stations. These stations in 10 years will cost the Government over \$280,000 when numbered stations, that is, those postal branches in stores—would give equal and frequently better accommodations to the public at a cost not to exceed \$75,000 over this same period. But then there would not be so many nice leases, which have proven so profitable to the postmaster.

Fifth. Telling the truth to investigators as to the postmaster's full knowledge of and participation in the leasing of the St. Paul commercial postal station.

Sixth. Refusing to perjure themselves by complying with the request of the postmaster that they make affidavits that the postmaster was giving full time to the post office, when in fact he was not.

These are a sample of some of the charges as they would read if honestly made.

The man Moos, we are told by the Postmaster General, is one of the best postmasters in the United States. I am not surprised that Brown thinks so.

I will read a telegram I received yesterday.

The executive committee of the Republican city and county committee of Ramsey County strongly urge the early disposition of the postmastership in St. Paul. In harmony with general feeling of strong Republicans in this county we feel that delay in this matter is injuring interest of Republican Party in county and State. Use your best efforts to have the President act promptly in this matter.

GEORGE LONDON,

Chairman City and County Committee.

What I want to know is, Am I to be recognized by the administration as part of the Republican organization or am I not. If I am, I want the usual and customary privilege of having my recommendations respected on postmasters in my district. This is done with the postmasters at North St. Paul and White Bear, why not at St. Paul?

I want this question as to whether I am to be considered part of the Republican organization answered before the Republicans in the House caucus on the 26th of this month.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a few days ago I made the statement that neither the President, the Red Cross, or the Congress had any statistics, the result of a thorough survey, that would enable anyone to state just what the actual situation was in the drought area and in the large municipalities. I stated then that it would at least be May before any farmers would be able to take from the soil any garden crops, and that it would be as late as July and August in some States before they could produce food. I contended that this would require some agency to feed the people in distress up to that time, and further that no one at this time could estimate the cost.

It would be appalling, in my opinion, for the Congress to adjourn without making some provision for the expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury to meet this situation, provided other methods failed.

In an appeal for money the Red Cross of my city, St. Louis, have just issued a statement that 900,000 people are in actual want in the seven States of Missouri, Illinois, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas. This only refers to 7 States among the 21 States in the drought area.

Nothing is said concerning conditions in the cities, where the cost of living exceeds that in the country, and where millions are unemployed and have no means of providing for their dependents.

I desire in my time to read an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 3, a great newspaper, one that has always taken a decided stand in regard to Federal-aid projects. The editorial depicts a situation that is to say the least alarming. It follows:

WHILE THE PEOPLE STARVE

Washington is fighting furiously, and the Red Cross is poignantly appealing for funds to a public that is responding slowly and disappointingly, and people impoverished by the drought are in desperate circumstances.

A circular letter from the St. Louis chapter of the Red Cross tells how terribly money is needed. It is needed for food, clothing, medicine. It is needed to save life. The situation is described in the letter as appalling. There are 900,000 people in actual want, we are told, in the seven States of Missouri, Illinois, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas. "And this from only 7 of the 21 States in the drought area." A quota of \$220,000 was fixed for the St. Louis chapter. Thus far only \$108,000 has been pledged, and that under the pressure of unusual solicitation.

How much money should be provided properly to meet the relief requirements apparently is not known. No survey has been made, no information assembled, which would enable the administration or Congress or the public or the Red Cross to proceed intelligently.

In the unbecoming controversy at Washington those who propose action by the Government have asserted that the \$10,000,000 to be raised by public subscription for the Red Cross is miserably inadequate. The letter from the St. Louis chapter seems to confirm that judgment.

The Post-Dispatch is not alarmed by the cry of precedent. We can not share the fears of those who see afar the deplorable consequences to follow the Government's discharge of a humanitarian obligation. We are confronted by an emergency without parallel in our history. Emergency legislation, to be sure, contains the seed of permanent policy, but that is a risk which governments must take, and that is a responsibility which resolute statesmanship does not shirk. To temporize with destitution, to theorize about the wisdom or propriety of governmental conduct when unknown thousands of our people are in the grip of famine, seems to us an indefensible attitude. Particularly so when in all probability the problem is one beyond the capacity of private agencies dependent upon voluntary support.

The demands upon all of us to-day are truly arduous. Every man and woman of self-respect is doing his generous utmost. There is a limit to the individual purse, or, at least, to the measure of optional response. Everyone is aware, of course, that money expended by the Government comes necessarily from the pockets of the people. But that authority is vested in the Government, and we are confident that the Government's exercise of that authority at this time will be approved with a cheerful amen.

But suppose the opponents of the Government's intervention to supply food to our hungry people prevail! And suppose, too, that the Red Cross can not meet the requirements because of the public's failure! What then? It will be a bitterly empty triumph for the theorists about precedent and the alarmists about the dole, if American men and women and children perish of starvation because the Government felt it would be imprudent to come to their aid. That is a hypothesis which the Government at Washington can not afford to have develop into an indictment.

The Hoover administration, it seems to us, has idled away time that should have been searchingly employed. The requirements of our devastated area should have been ascertained with reasonable accuracy long ago. The public should have been apprised of the facts. The question of whether the necessity could have been met by voluntary efforts or should have been met by the agency of Government ought long since to have been determined. This has not been done. To-day popular discussion of the situation is restricted largely to adjectives of despair, as evidenced in the letter of the St. Louis chapter of the Red Cross, and the dismal disproportion between relief and need.

The administration has dawdled far too long. It should act. It can much better face the speculative consequences of action than the certain ghastly consequences of inaction.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from southeast Missouri [Mr. SHORT] made the statement on this floor a few days ago that he would not approve appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the purpose of purchasing food for those in distress. He said his constituents were not beggars in urging the enactment of legislation for the Government to take over drainage bonds. When people are hungry they want something to eat. What good will it do his people for the Government to take over the drainage bonds if they die of starvation? I am sure if he could hear their voices they would say, "Give us food and take care of the drainage bonds after our families are provided for." The situation in his district in many places is the same as the situation in Arkansas.

I assume a different attitude than my colleague. I am unwilling to leave here until I am satisfied that the starving will be fed.

I want it to be of record that I favor Government aid to meet the greatest emergency that the country has faced since its inception, an emergency too great to be handled by popular subscription. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As I understand, somewhere around 100,000,000 bushels of wheat has been accumulated by the Federal Farm Board. Why would it not be well to grind up some of that wheat and send it to these people and relieve the board of the necessity of selling it, because, if they should try to sell it, it would depress the market at a time when the grain elevators of the country are bulging with wheat and the people are starving?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It does not make any difference to me whether you grind up that wheat and feed it to the people or appropriate money to buy flour that is already available, but we should certainly do something.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. BOYLAN. May I ask the gentleman whether he considers it ethical to feed donkeys and mules and hogs and poultry and unethical to feed starving men, women, and children?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I certainly do not. Feed the people first. I think the gentleman from New York and myself are in full accord on this question.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman noticed that during this Congress, the Congress passed and the President signed a bill granting \$500,000,000 to the Farm Board for the farmers who have wheat and has refused to appropriate any money at all for people who have no wheat?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am in receipt of a communication from Mr. William Turnblazer, president district 19, United Mine Workers, inclosing a very interesting statement calling attention to a very deplorable situation in the coal fields of southeastern Kentucky and Tennessee, where an effort is being made to further reduce the wage scale of the miners of that area. Already, Mr. Chairman, the wages of the miners in that territory have been cut to the point where the very best miners are barely able to eke out a miserable existence for themselves and their families, but not withstanding this melancholy fact it appears that further wage reductions are being proposed and enforced. Due to low wages and the fact that the mines in that region are operated only two or three days to the week, there is genuine distress in the mining camps, and unless something is done, and speedily done, to relieve the situation the end can not be prophesied. The miners in that area are 95 per cent native-born, peaceful, patriotic American citizens.

In order that the country may know of the terrible conditions prevailing in this great mining district, I desire to include in my remarks President Turnblazer's statement. I ask unanimous consent for such permission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to include the statement referred to as an extension of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STARVATION OF COAL MINERS OF SOUTHEASTERN KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE MUST STOP

During the past several weeks the coal operators of southeastern Kentucky and Tennessee, with the possible exception of a few companies, have again put wage reductions in effect and the miners and their families are not only on a bare existence basis but a condition of actual starvation now confronts our people.

This is surely a terrible condition to prevail in the richest country in the world—our own United States. It is a tragedy that will end in the killing of every hope for the miners and their families unless the men working in the coal mines of southeastern Ken-

tucky and Tennessee arouse themselves and with the courage and faith of our forefathers fight intelligently to the last ditch to prevent further wage reduction and degradation to themselves and their families.

Imagine, if you will, that the miners and their wives and little children are forced to sacrifice and further degrade themselves due to the insane policy of the coal operators in selling coal below the cost of production to the large corporations. The people and industries of the United States can and will consume, in any given year, only the amount of coal they need. Reducing the wage of the coal miner will not bring any more demand for coal.

What's the answer? Well, from the miner's standpoint, there is only one thing to do, and that is to fight and fight and fight against this terrible degradation that is being heaped upon you and your families by these senseless coal operators. We have appealed to the present administration at Washington, in person and by petition.

Stop these wage reductions. Stop these unbearable conditions. Stop working at mines that fail to pay on the regular pay day.

Read what the largest corporation in the world says about wage reductions:

"It is my deliberate judgment," said James A. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation, "that a general reduction in wages in this country, instead of relieving the situation, would set back the impending recovery by at least two years."

He further states, "Apparently those who advocated the wage reductions have not stopped to weigh the implications, that instead of tending to increase consumption of industrial and agricultural products, such reductions must inevitably reduce the purchasing power of the wage earner and restrict consumption."

Due to mass production the workday in America is being shortened. What about the American miners' workday? The 8-hour day in the coal mines has been eliminated, and is a lost art; the 9, 10, and 12 hour day has been substituted along with the clean-up system that requires you to remain at the face until you load up all your coal and the necessary day labor required to remain without compensation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, two months ago when Congress convened we had two pressing emergency problems presented to us for solution. One was to provide for the distress and suffering in the drought-stricken areas of the South and Southwest. The other was to devise plans or means to correct or relieve the distress prevailing throughout the country on account of unemployment.

There is some difference of opinion as to whether we have met and solved the first problem; that is, making provision for the distress in the drought-stricken area. Some contend we have; others say we have not.

So far the action of Congress reminds me of the newly hired man on the farm, who, when asked by his employer what he had fed the horses and ducks, replied that he had given them "hay," and then when asked if the ducks had eaten any, he said, "Not when I left, but they were still talking about it." Congress is still talking about relieving the suffering in the drought-stricken areas, as well as the condition of the unemployed in other sections. I have stated that some take the position that Congress has already done what it can consistently to relieve suffering in the dry areas, whereas others seem to think that Congress is not charged with the responsibility of guaranteeing employment to the unemployed.

It is not my purpose to discuss either of the contentions from a theoretical standpoint, or discuss them in the abstract. However, I want to state with as much emphasis as I can command that if Congress by its actions or policies in the past is in any way responsible for the condition of the unemployed, it should take whatever steps are necessary and consistent with its powers to correct and relieve the situation, or possibly I should have reversed part of the statement and suggested that Congress should first "relieve" and then "correct" the situation. Of course, if Congress or the Government is in no way responsible for the unusual and general unemployment in our country, then the wisdom of taking any action in the matter may be properly questioned.

Therefore, before attempting to discuss or outline plans or methods for relieving conditions confronting the unemployed we should inquire into the real or underlying causes and see whether Congress or the Government, by the action of either or both, is in any way responsible for the general

unemployment; see if there is any real justification for appropriate action on the part of Congress, or determine whether there is any real or valid reason why it should not act.

I think it will be generally admitted that the greatest percentage of unemployment is found in industry, or that it is the result of industrial inactivity superinduced by industrial overproduction. That is, manufacturers tell us their storage plants and warehouses are filled to overflowing with the products from their establishments; that they are unable to find markets for all of their products; that they could no longer afford to continue operations with their surpluses growing larger every day and their incomes growing proportionately less. They tell us that it was absolutely necessary to curtail their operations, and as a consequence their employees found themselves without work. This is almost the universal story coming from industry. We know the Government has little or nothing to do with the management of industrial plants and therefore can not regulate production in a way that supply would be equal to or in keeping with demand. This is a matter entirely within the hands of the management of various industrial enterprises. However, it is pertinent for us to inquire as to the real or underlying reasons or causes for increasing the supply out of all proportion to demand or capacity for consumption. That is, we might make inquiry as to the real reason for this large overproduction or underconsumption, whichever you may choose to call it. Probably the answer from no two persons or no two sources would be exactly alike, but in the main they would all say that the means for production had increased out of proportion to the capacity for consumption. Why? I think if we should inquire further you will find that the unusual inducement or protection afforded by Congress against foreign competition with reference to a manufactured commodity or commodities has made attractive fields for investments with big profits.

As a result capital has been attracted from less productive channels; new plants have been constructed, others remodeled, and the most modern machinery installed. Then in the mad rush of the captains of industry to secure more than their equitable share of the profits and to pile them mountain high speeded production in every conceivable way, day and night shifts were inaugurated, "stretch-out" policies adopted to such an extent that production increased until the saturation point was reached. Surpluses piled up to such an extent that industry began to reduce wages or reduce the number of its employees, feeling that by the adoption of such a policy it would be able to adjust expenses and maintain a profitable income, but industry soon found that consumption was decreasing out of proportion to that of production and said it was absolutely necessary to close the factory, the mine, the shop, and other industrial activities. Hundreds, thousands, yea, millions of men were thrown out of employment, the door of opportunity was closed in their faces, and their purchasing power and consequent consuming capacity almost wholly destroyed.

The real cause back of such a status, therefore, is traceable to the action of Congress when, in order to assist the manufacturer, protect the "infant industry," or encourage industrial activities, the inducement offered, or the protection afforded was more than a practical application of the policy warranted. That is, in its alleged desire to assist industry, as well as labor, a Congress of ill-advised high protectionists furnished the means, agency, or machinery that has operated as a millstone about their necks.

To-day the wheels of industry are idle, the hum of machinery is silent, the hands of the laborer are stilled. For the past six months or more both labor and industry have been moving around with misguided and unsandaled feet trying to extricate themselves from an industrial depression unparalleled in the annals of our Nation. The problem is acute and demands immediate consideration. What are we going to do about it? What will Congress do to relieve the present situation? Then what will Congress do to prevent a recurrence of these troublous times?

PAYMENT ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

It has been suggested that the adjusted-service certificates held by World War veterans be paid at once so as to relieve suffering. I can see two good reasons why Congress should take such action. In the first place, it will afford food and clothing to millions now in distress. It will give relief to a large percentage of veterans and their families who are now in need and out of employment. Consumption will be increased, and it will in a measure relieve industry and agriculture of the surplus of their products, giving each an opportunity to resume its activities and give honest labor another chance to earn a living and provide for the comforts of life. Some will say this is not sufficient to meet the emergency for the reason that only a small percentage of those unemployed hold adjusted-service certificates, and it would, consequently, afford no immediate relief to the millions of others out of employment. We would be unfair not to admit the force of this statement, but it should be observed that simply because such action will not give full relief is no reason or argument why it should not be taken, because it will certainly give partial relief and we can look for other methods or some other sources for further relief.

To my mind this would be a wise step, as I have just stated, because it will relieve thousands of veterans who are out of employment and in distress, both in the drought-stricken area as well as in other sections; but it will not solve the entire problem, because we have millions of people in a most distressed condition on account of unemployment who do not hold adjusted-service certificates.

Therefore, while it is important and almost indispensable, apparently, at this time that action should be taken whereby these men should have the right to draw what is due or what may be due on their adjusted-service certificates, we must go further than this if we are to solve the problem of the unemployed.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Does the gentleman figure that with respect to what is due as of to-day? Is that the way the gentleman would calculate it? In other words, if a man had a \$1,500 certificate and it is worth \$580 right now, is that the amount the gentleman would recognize as the amount that he should draw?

Mr. HARE. Personally, I would recognize any amount, even up to the total.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I understand that; but what is the gentleman's idea? I want to see what the gentleman's thought is, and I am asking the question for information.

Mr. HARE. I believe we can pay the whole amount.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. What does the gentleman mean by "the whole amount"—what would be due in 1945 or what is due to-day?

Mr. HARE. The whole amount that would be due in 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. In other words, the gentleman would favor paying everything as of 1945 instead of what has been actually earned as of to-day?

Mr. HARE. Yes. But I did not rise to discuss that phase of the question further than to emphasize that the payment of these certificates would be one way of relieving those in distress and aiding in the solution of the unemployment problem. Of course, since the committee is now considering the advisability of reporting a bill providing for the payment of these certificates, I want to avail myself of this opportunity and say to the committee that prompt and favorable action on its part is extremely vital, for many veterans in my district are not only urging but demanding immediate action on the part of Congress and, as we all know, Congress can not act until the committee reports. I sincerely trust that the committee will report a bill within the next few days so it may be considered and passed before Congress adjourns March 4, and hope it will be a bill that will give some real relief and not be a mere gesture.

But regardless of what action the committee and Congress may take with reference to paying these certificates, a great part of the great problem confronting the unemployed will remain unsolved. There is distress in this coun-

try that the bonus fund will not reach, and it is that remaining part of the problem to which I would like to address my further remarks.

INAUGURATE A GOVERNMENT BUILDING PROGRAM

We heard the President and those associated with him suggest last fall that we had a serious business depression in our country and that men with capital and men at the head of business enterprises were urged to avail themselves of this opportunity to enlarge, remodel, or repair their plants in order to afford employment to the millions of unemployed.

That was a good suggestion; it was in harmony with good, sound business judgment; but there is an old adage which says that "Charity should begin at home." I am wondering, therefore, whether our Government has any unfinished business, any uncompleted business, or any new business to which it could direct its attention, and thereby give employment to the unemployed. Those in charge of our governmental affairs have appealed to business men to do this. Why not take stock or make an inventory of our own business and see if there is not something we can do to relieve the situation?

In this connection I want to call attention to H. R. 15358, which provides that the Congress of the United States shall appropriate sufficient funds to construct a building in every town and city in the United States where it is renting quarters to accommodate postal facilities in second and third class post offices. This would mean an average of six to eight buildings to every county in the United States, or an average of 30 to 35 in each congressional district. It would take up the slack of unemployment in nearly every section of the country. At the same time it would be doing something constructive on the part of the Government, and it would be doing just what our leaders and business men have been advised to do.

It would be economy, too, because it would relieve the Post Office Department of about \$15,000,000 annually for rent, and the total cost for such buildings complete would not exceed \$400,000,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How can we get the drawings and specifications to do this work. I have had two buildings over in Baltimore, and it takes so long to get the drawings and specifications out.

Mr. HARE. I agree with the gentleman in that the Government is exceedingly slow in the construction of buildings even after they are authorized and the money provided.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why not give the architects in the country some work? They are all needing it.

Mr. HARE. If this bill should pass it would give the architects something to do, and many others now unemployed. It would give the brickmaker, the cement maker, the lumberman, and the steel men, and those engaged in many other activities something to do.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But how can you start until you get the drawings and specifications? Why not give the architects of the country an opportunity to make them?

Mr. HARE. You can not authorize drawings and specifications until buildings are authorized. If you will help pass this bill we would be compelled to have architects, and that would give employment for them as well as others, but we have very few architects unemployed. It is the great mass of unemployed who earn bread by the sweat of their brow I am speaking for.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is it not a fact that recently we passed a bill giving the Treasury Department authority to employ outside architects for the purpose of accomplishing this Federal work?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further, for my time is limited.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to see anybody get a place of that kind. I have not been able to do it.

Mr. HARE. I consider the building program suggested in the bill referred to as being a sound business problem for the Government, because we have about 14,000 buildings rented to-day by the Post Office Department at a cost of approximately \$15,000,000 a year. Why, in the name of common sense, should we not take an inventory of our own business and take the lead in trying to revive business throughout the country by setting our own house in order, by constructing these buildings in every town that has a second or third class post office, and by putting the men in the various sections of our country to work at once?

The cost per building would run from \$10,000 to \$60,000, depending, of course, on the size of the town, the annual postal receipts, and the prospects for immediate increase. It would mean a saving of approximately \$15,000,000 annually in the way of rentals and I might say in passing that you will never be able to run the Post Office Department without an annual deficit until you furnish it with the machinery to carry on its business and thereby eliminate some of its excessive overhead expenses. The passage of this bill will be an investment that will pay the equivalent of about 4 per cent interest annually which is about as high a rate of interest obtained by the Government on any loan or investment made except the 6 per cent interest obtained from World War veterans on loans made on their adjusted-service certificates, and I pause long enough to say there is no reason or justification whatever for such an extortionate rate; it should be reduced so as not to exceed the rate of interest obtained by the Government from any other source; or, as a matter of fact, no interest whatever should be charged on these loans, for it amounts to nothing more or less than making the veterans pay interest on that to which they are already entitled.

The inauguration of the proposed building program would not be paternalistic in character or smack of the dole system, of which we have heard so much at this session of Congress, but it would be a sound business investment, a laudable governmental policy adopted to meet a pressing need. I can not be too insistent, therefore, in emphasizing the urgent necessity for the consideration and enactment of this legislation, for it is designed to meet an emergency as well as a necessity.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The other plan I have to suggest for relieving unemployment is that Congress should take immediate action and make provision for the construction of rural post roads, more often referred to as rural free delivery routes. In making these suggestions I have not attempted to place them in the order of their importance or economic significance, for from the standpoint of furnishing immediate employment to the unemployed and taking into consideration the economic effect, the construction and maintenance of these roads would probably be of as much or greater importance than either of the suggestions already made. In the first place, if these roads were constructed and maintained according to modern road building requirements the cost of rural free delivery service to the Government would be decreased to such an extent that the savings would be sufficient to pay approximately 5 per cent on the money to be expended.

As these roads go into practically every rural community, it would mean an enormous saving in transportation costs to those who live in rural districts. A farmer would be able to carry his farm products to market in less than one-half the time now required. That is, such a policy would result in enormous economic value both to the Government and to the people living on or near these roads. Furthermore, it will be carrying out a policy that was evidently contemplated when our Constitution was adopted, for it will be recalled that the Constitution provides, "Congress shall have the right to establish post offices and post roads." I am thoroughly convinced that this exclusive right of Congress carries with it a corresponding obligation.

Congress has exercised the right to establish and maintain post offices for a hundred years or more, until to-day

there is not a locality that does not have a post office or is furnished with efficient postal facilities. The right to establish post offices, under the Constitution, is no greater than the right to establish post roads, and I think it is time that Congress should recognize the fact that the obligation to construct and maintain post roads is just as great as that to construct or maintain post offices, because I firmly believe that the Constitution imposes the same obligation, and I do not recall that there was ever a time better suited to inaugurate such a policy than at the present, for it would aid in relieving distress among the unemployed and at the same time discharge a long-standing obligation on the part of the Government.

Of course, I realize that the adoption of either or all three of the plans suggested will not insure permanent and adequate employment, because neither is in any way responsible for the industrial depression and the unemployment condition that has followed. Business depressions or economic ills, like human ills, are cured only when the cause is removed. Therefore, it is going to be necessary to remove the real or underlying causes for unemployment. I referred to some of them earlier in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARE. I regret that I can not proceed further at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have asked for these few minutes for the purpose of placing in the RECORD, if I may, a number of resolutions, letters, and telegrams that I have received in the interest of doing something for the World War veterans. I want it to go into the RECORD at this time that the soldiers of the eighteenth congressional district of Ohio almost to a man are in favor of legislation of some kind that will bring to their homes and their families some of the money that is promised to them in the certificates which they now hold. There are some soldiers in my district whom God has been good to, who do not need this relief at this time, but they have joined with the others in an almost unanimous request that something be done in the interest of those who do need it and need it so badly at this time. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing as part of my remarks at this time some of the telegrams, letters, and resolutions that I have received from soldiers in my district.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit, in publishing these resolutions does the gentleman propose to publish the signatures as well?

Mr. MURPHY. I have boiled them down. I had my secretary use only the headings and the names of the officers. I have cut out all of the names of the signers. I am just as jealous of the RECORD as is my friend from Illinois and I am sure he will not object to this simple request.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. There are no newspaper articles?

Mr. MURPHY. No. They are heart-throb letters.

Mr. BLANTON. They are the kind we want. I am glad that the gentleman is going to put them in, and I am glad that we have the declaration from the gentleman from Ohio, a distinguished and influential Member on the Republican side, that he is in favor of this legislation.

Mr. MURPHY. Oh, the gentleman knows that I have always been in favor of legislation for the ex-service men.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The gentleman from Texas says "this legislation." What is "this legislation"?

Mr. BLANTON. To pay this just Government debt to our ex-service men.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. What is the just debt?

Mr. BLANTON. To pay what they should have been paid in 1919 when they came home from France.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is that what the gentleman from Ohio is for?

Mr. MURPHY. I shall have to let the gentlemen who have taken the floor away from me decide that question according to their own fancy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. I herewith submit a list of resolutions, petitions, and letters I have received from veterans of the World War of the eighteenth congressional district of Ohio favoring payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates at this time.

In view of the voluminous nature of these communications, I simply give to you the name and address of the American Legion posts and number of signatures of each petition:

Resolutions from—American Legion post at Lisbon, Ohio; American Legion post at East Liverpool, Ohio; American Legion post at Powhatan Point, Ohio; American Legion post at Toronto, Ohio; American Legion post at Bethesda, Ohio; American Legion post at Mingo Junction, Ohio; American Legion post at St. Clairsville, Ohio; American Legion post at Wellsville, Ohio; American Legion post at Flushing, Ohio; American Legion post at Tiltonsville, Ohio; American Legion post at Bridgeport, Ohio; Veterans of the World War from East Liverpool, Ohio, with 26 signatures thereon.

Petition from—Veterans of Amsterdam, Ohio, with 26 signatures thereon; veterans of the World War at Amsterdam, Berghold, and vicinity, with 30 signatures thereon.

Letter from—W. V. Frazier, jr., attorney at law, Martins Ferry, Ohio; John W. Sumner, New Waterford, Ohio; A. G. Stidd, 3425 Franklin Street, Bellaire, Ohio; George Rily, route No. 1, East Liverpool, Ohio; James A. Rhodes, 318 Ridge Street, Leetonia, Ohio; Andrew E. Wild, 230 South High Street, Steubenville, Ohio; George W. Bowers, 517 Logan Street, Steubenville, Ohio.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to my friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who is the ranking Democratic Member on this side in charge of this bill, for the time which he has so graciously allowed me. I have been impressed ever since I came to Congress with the splendid valuable service that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has rendered to the country. [Applause.] In addition to his earnest, honest, energetic, conscientious legislative service, which in my judgment equals that of any other Member in the House, he has rendered valuable, distinct service to the country in his compilation of the House rules and precedents, without which none of us could get along. I have felt it an honor to have served with him, and I follow him on many things that he espouses in this House.

The ultimatum which the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] has served on the Republican steering committee in giving them to understand that before their caucus on February 26 they must tell him where he stands as a Republican; they must let him know whether, as a Republican Representative of this House he has any rights, is but the grumbling that has been going on a long time in this House. Grumbings! Many of these splendid Representatives who serve the majority party—

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield later.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Is all the grumbling on this side of the House?

Mr. BLANTON. The Republican grumbings I have in mind are on that side. I will yield in a minute. I want to finish my speech first. I do not want the gentleman to cut my remarks all to pieces.

Splendid Representatives who serve on the majority side of the House, where you Republicans now have a majority of 100, are getting tired of having everything run by just a little handful of Members. They believe in the seniority rule. That is one of the best rules we have. It is fair and just to everybody that a Member who comes here and gets his place on a committee and he goes up on the committee as he is reelected and continues to serve here, and when there is no other man above him he finally becomes chairman of the Committee. That seniority rule is a just and

fair one. They all believe in it and are perfectly willing for the chairman of the big committees to occupy their splendid quarters and to have all the extra privileges and prerogatives that are given them. They are perfectly willing for that, but they want to have some voice in the proceedings of the House and in the framing of legislation that affects their constituents just as it does the leaders of the House.

This grumbling has been going on for a long time. I was surprised the other day when the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. SNELL] in his speech on the floor Saturday said this:

The Rules Committee spends more time in getting the opinion and sentiment of this House than any other committee in it. We always have our members with ears and eyes open, trying to find real facts that are back of any controversial piece of legislation for the purpose of ascertaining the real sentiment of the Members in regard to it.

I imagine that having had "his ears and eyes open," and having heard these grumbings going on, it caused the gentleman to take the floor and make that speech. He knew the leaders must do something to stop this grumbling before this caucus that is to meet on February 26.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I promised to yield first to my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPROUL].

Mr. COLE. He is through.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I am through.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew he was through.

Mr. COLE. Has the gentleman from Texas ever known a time when the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SNELL] has not been willing to listen to any of us?

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell you about that in a minute. I am glad the gentleman asked me that. That is what the gentleman from New York said the other day.

Mr. COLE. Well, it is absolutely true. He has always been willing to listen to the Members of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute, and I will tell the gentleman.

The gentleman from New York then said:

The Rules Committee is not a legislative committee. It is very largely a procedure committee, and in latter days it has been considered, to a certain extent, a political committee. * * * It is to act in coordination and harmony with the steering committee of the House.

Then he went on to say:

It is the duty of the Rules Committee, as I understand it, to act, as far as possible, for the protection of the administration and the administration's program of legislation.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] called attention to the fact that there are three distinct branches of this Government, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The executive branch has nothing in the world to do with the laws that we pass here further than to recommend its program. We are the legislators of the people of this country, and the distinguished gentleman from New York, notwithstanding the fact there are three separate and distinct branches, got up on the floor and told us that he considers it the duty of the Rules Committee to carry out the legislative program of the President of the United States, and he thus becomes the servant and he would have the House thus become the servant of the Executive in the White House when we ought to be free agents here to carry out our own judgment and our own will.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly. Can the gentleman explain it?

Mr. COLE. The three branches of this Government are coordinate branches, are they not?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will explain that. All three have separate, distinct functions, and none can encroach upon the others.

Mr. COLE. All right. If they are coordinate branches, does the gentleman not think it tends to promote good legislation for them to coordinate now and then?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but in the finality we ought to impress upon our legislation our judgment and our wish

and our will, and not the judgment of the Chief Executive expressed through the chairman of the Rules Committee. But my friend from New York—

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment I will yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. We are all interested. We are trying to get you some facts.

Mr. BLANTON. In the first place, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] knew he must get these rumblings out of the way. He had heard it said from the press that unless they liberalized the rules and unless they had a proper discharge rule whereby they could discharge a committee that was pigeonholing good legislation, he was going to lose a lot of votes on the other side of the aisle, and that probably you Republicans could not organize the House, and so he must get that rumbling out of the way.

I called attention last Monday evening, when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] was on the floor, to the fact that the press had reported they were going to give him a little sop to hold him in line so that they could get his vote. They found out that he was disgruntled. They found out he was going to demand a real discharge rule, and the press said he was going to be handed some sop. He denied it, but the next morning (Tuesday) when the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, last Tuesday morning, to take up the appropriation bill, I noticed the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Speaker, when he called a Member to preside over the Committee of the Whole House, called the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]. [Laughter.] That was the first little sop handed out to him.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think in fairness to the Speaker it should be said that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has presided over the committee in the consideration of this bill one if not two years heretofore, and knows the bill, and that is the practice.

Mr. BLANTON. Be that as it may, it was sop. It is sop to any of us.

Mr. SIMMONS. I had known for several days that he was to preside over this bill when it came on to this floor.

Mr. BLANTON. Every Member of this House on the Republican side of the aisle knows that whenever the Speaker calls you up there to that stand to preside over the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union you consider it a distinct honor.

Mr. COLE. Surely; it is an honor.

Mr. BLANTON. It is sop to you. [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. BLANTON. Well, all right.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Wait a minute. I can not yield now; I am sorry.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I have been trying to get the gentleman to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. All right. I will yield to the only dry distiller I ever knew in my life.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Would the gentleman be willing to discontinue the Rules Committee entirely and not have any Rules Committee?

Mr. BLANTON. No. We need one, but I want to be able, when a committee deliberately pigeonholes a good bill, to discharge that committee and let the House consider it. Let me call your attention to what the gentleman from New York said. You know he had to "sic" you boys onto somebody else. You were after him and after the Speaker and after the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] for a proper discharge rule, and he had to "sic" you off onto somebody else, so he "sicked" you off onto the minority leader. Here is what he said:

Our friends on the Democratic side of late are having a great deal of trouble about the triumvirate on the Republican side of the House. Let me call your attention, gentlemen, to the fact that instead of a triumvirate on your side, if there is such a word, you have a "oneumvirate," and the best part of it is he makes you

like it; and there is not a single one of you who dares to raise his voice above a whisper in opposition to the czarlike rule of the leader of the minority at the present time.

Mr. COLE. Which is true.

Mr. BLANTON. Which is as untrue as any statement that has ever been made upon this floor. [Applause.] I have been here 13 years. I have opposed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] many times, and he has opposed me. I have had different ideas. I have never hesitated a minute to say what I pleased, even when he did not like it; and he has said what he pleased when I did not like it; and I have followed him when what he stood for appealed to me and my heart and I have dared not to follow him when it did not. And all other Democrats have done the same. You older Members will remember that even when I was a youngster here, beginning my second term, way back on January 5, 1919, just as soon as this House met I rose and got recognition from the Speaker, and I held the House floor practically all day long, with my Democratic leaders, like Mr. Kitchin, Finis Garrett, and others, opposing me, and I got the House to pass 10 resolutions that day before we closed, one to try to stop the abuses that were going on in each one of the 10 departments of the Government. I passed some of them with roll calls, and to show that when a Democrat wants to oppose JOHN GARNER he can do it I will now give you this specific data from the RECORD of June 5, 1919. That is the way with every Democrat here; we follow JOHN GARNER when we want to follow him. We follow him because he is right.

Mr. COLE. It is the same way over here.

Mr. BLANTON. And many of you Republicans follow him as much as we Democrats do, and you know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLE. We only follow him when he is right.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me call your attention to the facts from the RECORD.

In the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, which had convened on May 19, 1919, the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 5, 1919, shows that immediately after the House of Representatives convened on that day I secured recognition from the Speaker and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 66, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Department of Agriculture.

In spite of protests and objections raised by Hon. Claude Kitchen, then Democratic leader, and Hon. Finis Garrett, who was later Democratic leader, and by some other prominent Members, both Democrats and Republicans, my motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 66.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, likewise shows that I retained the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 65, which I theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Department of Labor.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 65.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 67, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Department of the Interior.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 67.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 68, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Navy Department.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 68.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 69, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Department of Justice.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 69.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 70, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee, and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Post Office Department.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 70.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 71, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 71.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 72, which I had theretofore introduced, and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the United States Railroad Administration.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 72.

After my said House Resolution No. 72 had been passed I made the following unanimous-consent request:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dewalt; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Sims; and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Esch, have convinced me that this Railroad Administration resolution should have a hearing before their committee. Having been convinced by them on that point, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw the resolution from the consideration of the House and that the motion whereby the committee was discharged from further consideration be vacated, so that the resolution may be sent to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all proceedings had up to this time on the resolution be vacated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service Commission from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 73, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the United States Civil Service Commission.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 73.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 74, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the War Department.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee and then passed my said House Resolution No. 74. But on the passage of this resolution, the RECORD further shows that the yeas and nays were demanded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] who is our present Democratic leader, and on such vote by yeas and nays, my said resolution was passed by the vote of 181 yeas to 109 nays. Such prominent Republicans as ACKERMAN, BACHARACH, Campbell of Kentucky, CHINDELOM, CRAMTON, CROWTHER, DALLINGER, DARROW, DICKINSON, DOWELL, DUNBAR, ELLIOTT, FESS (now Senator), FORDNEY, FREAR, FRENCH, Graham of Illinois, Green of Iowa, Greene of Massachusetts, HADLEY, HAUGEN, HAWLEY, HOCH, JOHNSON of South Dakota, KNUTSON, LONGWORTH (now Speaker), LUCE, McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Madden, MAPES, MICHENER, MILLER, Mondell (Republican floor leader), Moore of Pennsylvania, MURPHY, Newton of Minnesota (now Secretary to President Hoover), PURNELL, RAMSEYER, REED of New York, Robsion (afterwards Senator), SHREVE, Sinnott, SMITH of Idaho, STRONG, SUMMERS, TAYLOR of Tennessee, TIMBERLAKE, TINKHAM, TOWNER, VESTAL, Volstead, Walsh of Massachusetts (now judge supreme court there), WHITE of Maine (elected Senator), and Wood of Indiana (present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations) all voted "yea" in helping me to pass said resolution.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], chairman of the Committee on Rules, in his speech the other day, claimed that our distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. GARNER, was a czar and that he ruled with an iron hand all Democrats, and that they were afraid to oppose him on anything. And to illustrate just how far he was mistaken, said RECORD for June 5, 1919, shows that such prominent Democrats as the said Mr. GARNER; Champ Clark, Speaker; Claude Kitchen, then Democratic leader; Finis Garrett, later Democratic leader; and many other prominent Democrats opposed and voted against my said resolution, although there were many distinguished Democrats like ALMON, AYRES, EVANS of Montana, Scott Ferris, HEFLIN (now Senator), HUDDLESTON, Johnson of Kentucky, Kincheloe, McCLINTIC, QUIN, Raker, Randall of California, Rubey, Tillman, and others who supported same.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department from further consideration of my House resolution No. 75, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Treasury Department.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee, and then, in an attempt to defeat my resolution, a motion was made to recommit same to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department. There was a yea and nay vote on that proposal and, by a vote of 116 yeas to 162 nays, the House refused to recommit my resolution to the committee, and then adopted and passed my said House resolution No. 75.

The said RECORD for June 5, 1919, further shows that I continued to hold the floor, under recognition of the Speaker, and moved to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce from further consideration of my House Resolution No. 76, which I had theretofore introduced and which had been referred to said committee and held up by it without any action being taken thereon, the purpose of such resolution being to discontinue abuses and extravagances then existing in the Department of Commerce.

My motion for the previous question was ordered, and the House passed my said motion to discharge the committee, and on the passage of the resolution a roll call was forced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] present Democratic leader, and my said resolution was passed by a vote of 185 yeas with only 89 nays against it.

The RECORD shows that after the passage of each one of said resolutions I made a motion to reconsider the vote by which said resolution was passed and lay that motion on the table, which in each case was adopted and which made the action of the House that day on each of said resolutions final. And the proceedings for that day, covering pages 696 to 714 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show that I held the floor during practically the entire day, until all of my said resolutions had been passed by the House.

I mention the above facts to show that it is not true "that there is not a single Democrat who dares to raise his voice." and so forth.

I will tell you what is the matter. Do you know why the gentleman from New York was trying to sic you onto the minority leader? It was because he knows that that minority leader is the only man in this House who has ever been able to get up on this floor and make that triumvirate tremble in their boots. [Applause.] You know that. Let me call your attention to what he did on April 16, 1926. You remember our good friend from New York, one of the smartest men I ever knew in my life, Ogden Mills, who served with us here with such distinction, that great official juggler of figures down in the Treasury Department right now. He has recently inherited an extra fortune of about \$25,000,000, although already rich, hence payment of adjusted-compensation certificates to ex-service men now seem to him ridiculous. You remember he has been coming up here trying to block this bill to pay the adjusted compensation to ex-service men. You know what JOHN GARNER did one time. He made him tremble. On April 16, 1926, JOHN GARNER rose in his place here on this floor and he said:

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, if the program said to be authorized by the administration is to be followed, within a short time, a week or 10 days, you will be called upon to vote on the most important piece of legislation, outside of the tax bill, that will come before this Congress.

Now, listen, Mr. GARNER further said:

It is the most stupendous steal that has ever been suggested in the history of America. I want to suggest to the membership to examine the hearings in order that you may be informed in reference to the bill, H. R. 10820, the Mills bill.

Denouncing a bill that had been introduced by Mr. Mills as the most stupendous steal that had ever been perpetrated in this country. Was there a Republican that called him down? No. Did the chairman of the Rules Committee call him down? No.

Why, they were afraid to call him down because they knew JOHN GARNER had the facts. Did they say, "You have no right to say that your colleague has introduced a bill that is a stupendous steal"? Why, no.

Mr. GARNER talked about the \$250,000,000 it would take, and then he said: "The record shows that the President is very much interested in this bill," and the very next day you had Ogden Mills getting the floor, with the help of JOHN GARNER—he can help you Republican leaders get the floor when you want it [laughter]—he helped him get the floor and here is what Mr. Mills said:

Mr. Speaker, when I returned to Washington after an absence of one day, my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] informed me that in looking over the list of claimants who had received awards from the Mixed Claims Commission and whose claims therefore were covered by the bill H. R. 10820, introduced by me, he found there was a company in which I was a director and stockholder. As soon as he called that matter to my attention I telephoned the office of the company in New York and I found that the information of the gentleman from Texas was correct.

The information of our minority leader [Mr. GARNER] is usually correct. Mr. Mills did not even know in what corporations he was a director and a stockholder and had to telephone to New York to find out whether he was a stockholder and a director in this corporation.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No; whether they had such a claim or not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Mills said:

And I found that the information of the gentleman from Texas was correct.

Then what did he do? Did he say it was not a stupendous steal? Did he tell you that JOHN GARNER had misrepresented his bill? No; here is what Mr. Mills further said:

That being so, irrespective of any rule of the House, but as a matter of what I consider proper conduct on the part of a Representative, I want to say to the House that I do not care, either in the Ways and Means Committee or on the floor of the House, to participate further in the consideration of that particular bill.

And thus he threw that bill out of the back door of the country because the distinguished minority leader of this House had the guts to stand up here and tell you that a stupendous steal was about to be perpetrated upon the taxpayers of this country. [Applause.]

This is why your great chairman of the Rules Committee got up here and "sicked" you on JOHN GARNER.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. This is why your chairman of the Rules Committee got up here and wanted to sic you men on our minority leader. He wanted to get him out of the way.

Mr. COLE rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to any of you gentlemen.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman does not want the statement to stand in the RECORD that he believes Mr. Ogden Mills was about to perpetrate a steal or that he would participate in a steal? He is an honorable man.

Mr. BLANTON. No such statement is in the RECORD. Certainly Ogden Mills is an honorable man. I want to say there is not a man in this country who has better judgment about the legislation that comes before the Ways and Means Committee than JOHN GARNER. He always watches it, and when he took the floor here and told you that this bill (H. R. 10820) was the most stupendous steal that had ever been attempted in the history of America JOHN GARNER knew what he was talking about, and Ogden Mills did not deny it, and not a single man here denied it, and no man took offense at what Mr. GARNER said, and it is in the permanent RECORD to-day uncontroverted. And in the face of this Ogden Mills came in here and admitted that he was interested in the bill, withdrew it, and you have never heard anything of it since.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman does not mean to imply that Mr. Mills admitted he had been trying to participate in a steal?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly not. I am leaving the Garner facts about the bill where they are.

Mr. COLE. Oh, no; the gentleman does not mean to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. I have as much respect and regard for Ogden Mills as any man in the House has, and I have imputed no dishonesty to him.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman has made a serious charge here.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I do not believe the gentleman from Texas means that.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not mean that Ogden Mills himself was perpetrating a steal, but I do mean to say that JOHN GARNER must have had authority for what he said so far as that bill was concerned, or the bill would not have been withdrawn and it would not have been stopped where it was stopped.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The gentleman admitted a while ago that Mr. Mills did not know he was interested in the company, and therefore, he could not have been responsible.

Mr. BLANTON. It was the bill, H. R. 10820 which Mr. GARNER denounced as a "stupendous steal," and Mr. Mills checked it up and found Mr. GARNER's charge correct, and he then withdrew it.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. He could not have been responsible for something he did not know.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. GARNER did not charge Mr. Mills with dishonesty, and I have not charged him with it. Either some department or outside influence got Mr. Mills to introduce the bill, and it afterwards developed that he knew less about it than JOHN GARNER did.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will not the gentleman say, down in his own heart, that he does not believe for one minute that Mr. Mills had any intention of perpetrating any steal?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think he did, but I think the bill would have done all that the gentleman from Texas said. We all know that Ogden Mills is not dishonest.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask the gentleman another question? Does not the gentleman think that Mr. Mills's course regarding the bill, when he found out that he was a stockholder, was in keeping with his high sense of honor?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; he could not afford to do otherwise. I am impressed with his honesty, and respect him just as much as you do. But I say that these bills do come in here, and it takes a man like the minority leader to stand up and stop them. He stopped that bill, and don't you believe he did not. If he had not done what he did, that bill would not have been stopped. He stopped it, and you can not get him out of the way by the chairman of the Rules Committee getting up here and calling him a "oneumvirate." Now, here is what I want the chairman of the Rules Committee to answer. The chairman said that he never did control legislation, and made no attempt to do it. Does he remember the Rankin bill? That was considered for months by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and when the bill was reported it came to the House without a rule.

The Rankin bill was carefully considered, debated at length, not under a rule, but under the general rules of the House, and adopted by the membership and passed this House with only 49 votes against it.

It went to the Senate, and the Senate amended it, making it more likely to pass a veto than the House bill, and passed it by a vote of 66 to 6 on June 23, 1930.

There were only 6 votes in the Senate against it. It came back to the House as amended, and was considered here, and on June 25, 1930, this House, by unanimous vote approved of the Senate amendments, approved of the bill, and sent it to the White House.

The next morning the bill came back vetoed by the President.

Your Republican membership of this House under the leadership of this triumvirate—it being not what the membership wanted to do—after having voted for the bill unanimously, approving of the Senate amendment, but following the triumvirate, you saw them get up and vote 188 to 182 to sustain the President's veto. It was killed because we Democrats could not get enough votes to pass it over the President's veto.

Immediately after you saw the chairman of the Rules Committee pull out of his pocket a rule that had just been brought in to make in order a bill that no man on the minority side had ever seen, that no man had an opportunity to study, and no man knew what it contained, for the ex-service men of the country, and that rule passed after 20 minutes' debate on a side, the chairman on his side yielding such time to such members as he wanted.

I made him admit that day from the floor of the House that the membership of the House could not amend the bill, could not change the bill by the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." They had to take it just like the Rules Committee had brought it in—they had to vote it up or down, and being for the ex-service men and that being the only measure possible offering any relief, they voted it up and passed it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has made a direct statement that is not according to the facts. In the first place the Rules Committee never wrote the legislation. We never wrote the legislation. We had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. It was written under the approval of the steering committee.

Mr. SNELL. That is not the Rules Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a member of the steering committee.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York is not a member of the steering committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Is he not?

Mr. SNELL. No; he is not.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, he ought to be.

Mr. SNELL. And there is just about as much truth in the gentleman's statement of that as there is in anything else that he states.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not yield for that interpolation.

Mr. SNELL. That is all right. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. BLANTON. You sit down. The gentleman is the chairman of the Rules Committee, but he can not intimidate me. I do not yield to him.

Mr. SNELL. But you did before, and you have got enough.

Mr. BLANTON. I will make you sit down, just the same, because I have the floor.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not. I want first to attend to the gentleman from New York. Do you know why the grumbling has been going on all the time? That is just the way that this chairman of the Committee on Rules acts when somebody who is not up with him gets up here and is in debate with him. He wants to make him sit down. The people are getting tired of that in this House.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute. The gentleman ought to have been here a while ago when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] served notice on your caucus that you had to show him whether he had any rights here before he would come into the caucus, because he has been here long enough to know the seniority rules. Oh, yes; you Republicans gave him that fine suite of rooms upstairs, with everything surrounding him to make things pleasant. But he is no better than any the rest of us. He draws the same salary and he has got to go back home and get the votes of his constituency every two years to come back here. Just wait. He can not lord it over us, and he can not lord it over me. Now, I yield to the gentleman if he wants to ask me a question, but do not try to be impolite.

Mr. SNELL. I have not. I distinctly requested the gentleman to yield. The gentleman started the attack on me. I never made any attack on the gentleman and never started one.

Mr. BLANTON. But my attack is good-natured.

Mr. SNELL. I wanted you to confine yourself strictly to the facts as they were.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, we boys here—

Mr. SNELL. Oh, then you admit that you are just demagoguing? All right.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not. I think the chairman of the Rules Committee is the biggest demagogue in this House, with all due respect to him. I have seen him demagoguing, and I think he is the biggest, most consummate demagogue that I have ever seen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Yield me five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman now—

Mr. SNELL. No! Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. For a proper question.

Mr. SNELL. What do you call proper?

Mr. BLANTON. Something not offensive.

Mr. SNELL. You made an offensive statement to me. You do not try to make a statement, you know you do not, and the Members of this House know that you have demagogued more than any other man here.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not.

Mr. SNELL. I will leave that to the Members of the House. You do not dare put it to a vote.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just the attitude that has made the chairman of the Rules Committee unpopular with his own Members.

Mr. COLE. Oh, he is not unpopular.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from Iowa gets a little sop, but there are some others who do not. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] has not been getting any sop and the chairman of the Rules Committee from his long service knows how the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] feels just now, and he knows how the gentleman from Wisconsin, our beloved and distinguished legislator and statesman [Mr. COOPER], feels about these matters, and he knows how Mr. PEAVEY feels, and he knows how Mr. SCHAFER feels, and he knows how the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] feels, for all have demanded their rights here in times past.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I saw the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] when he was comparatively a youngster here. I saw him in one of the finest fights I ever saw made in a legislative body. He got up here against no power less than the most influential Member of this House, with all of his great influence, in that great dye-schedule fight, and Mr. FREAR won his fight, and carried the day. You remember that memorable fight that FREAR of Wisconsin made here? Do you not remember it? Why, I have admired Mr. FREAR ever since, because he was making a fight for the common people of this country against the special interests of the country. I know how Mr. FREAR feels on these matters.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will be decent, I will yield to him.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman never made a more demagogic statement than the one he just made.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just characteristic again of the domineering, demagoging chairman of the Rules Committee. Why, he is the most inconsiderate man of other people's rights that I ever saw. He does not consider the rights of other Members at all.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOWARD. Possibly to a point of order. I approve most of this language, but I suggest that it is out of harmony with the rules.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not responsible for it, Mr. Chairman. I was only answering what was said to me, and giving it back just like Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. TREADWAY wanted to give it back, and just as when a man from the other side of the Capitol attacks a Member of this House, whether

he is a Republican or a Democrat, I want him to have a chance to answer.

When the chairman of the Rules Committee attempts to say something to me that I do not like I am going to say it back to him in kind, not across the Capitol but to his face.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment, when I get through; yes.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will be decent, I will. Otherwise not.

Mr. SNELL. Did the gentleman ever know me to get up here and make any personal attack on him?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, you did a moment ago when I was speaking.

Mr. SNELL. When the gentleman called me a demagogue.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York called me a demagogue first. [Laughter and applause.] I do not yield further.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman does not yield, very well.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman had better change his tactics. He had better be more considerate of his ordinary Members on the Republican side. They are getting tired of it.

Mr. SNELL. Why does the gentleman not let them take care of their own situation?

Mr. BLANTON. They want a square deal. They are going to help us to organize the House. We are going to give them a square deal.

Mr. SNELL. They know how to get rid of me if they want to.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to read a letter.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to read one letter from the presiding elder in the Methodist Church—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas three additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank my friend sincerely. I can not find the letter just now. I can quote it. It is from a presiding elder, the Rev. Mr. George S. Slover, presiding elder of the Methodist Episcopal Church for most of district of Texas, and who lives in Stamford, Tex. He says he has driven all over his district, over 300 miles. He says many people are impoverished; that the men, women, and little children are in want and starving. He says there are many ex-service men there who need the money on their compensation certificates. He says he wants "this bunch of politicians up here in the House of Representatives to quit playing politics and to pass a measure to pay that adjusted compensation to the soldiers, if they want the support of the ministers all over the country," and he asked me to call your attention to it.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLADAY. Was the letter addressed to the speaker personally?

Mr. BLANTON. It was addressed to me. [Laughter and applause.] He said he had no patience with a leadership that would refuse to pay its honest debts when the Government of the United States was as rich and powerful as it is. He was one who expected to get some action from Congress. He is just like every other Methodist minister in the United States, and some of them are not so unpopular as the one whom the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] has been after for a long time. Some of the others are very popular.

There are Baptist preachers, and Christian preachers, and Presbyterian preachers, and preachers of all other denominations, and business men who are backing these ex-service men in their just demand. You know you are going to have to do something before we adjourn. Why delay it? Talk about Ogden Mills and Mr. Mellon saying we can not pass a measure like this. Why not take the advice of the chairman of the General Electric Co., Owen D. Young? Is he not a good business man? He told your Ways and Means

Committee yesterday that you ought to vote at least \$500,000,000 in cash and pay that to these men, and in answer to Mr. GARNER he said he would relieve their distress if we had to pay the ex-service men a billion dollars. If the chairman of the great General Electric Co., the head of the great Power Trust of the United States, could make that suggestion, if he would admit that much, then you Republicans ought to do something before we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, no one familiar with American history can point to any period in our national life when there was more suffering from hunger or greater economic distress throughout this land. The situation is exceedingly serious. It deserves and should receive serious consideration.

The purpose of all just governments is to secure the happiness and welfare of the people, and a government that fails to attain that end signally fails to accomplish the purpose of its existence. Only incidentally is it the function of government to create wealth or enrich its people. Its primary purpose is to establish social order, guarantee social justice, and promote the comfort and welfare of its citizenry. And the well-being of the humblest citizen is as sacred as the privileges of those who sit in the seat of the mighty.

I am devoted to our institutions and believe that we have not only the most unique but the most benevolent and efficient government yet devised by the mind of man. However, that can not be truthfully said if our Government is so static, inelastic, hidebound, and impotent that we can not, as a nation, take affirmative legislative action to meet this emergency, succor starving men, women, and children, and relieve the appalling and unprecedented distress that now prevails throughout this land.

In great emergencies, such as the one that now confronts us, other nations by direct legislative action, by appropriations from the public treasury, feed their starving citizens and subjects. Is our beloved Republic less efficient, less competent, and less capable of dealing with situations of this character than the effete monarchies and quasi Republics of Europe? In this grave and very unusual situation should not our Congress and our President come as quickly to the relief of the starving men, women, and children in America as the crowned heads of Europe come to the relief of their suffering people? In periods of such unusual and unprecedented suffering, such as now prevails, if we stand mute and do nothing, do we not thereby confess that the European governments are more humane, more solicitous of the welfare of their citizens, and better able under their form of government to relieve distress than we are under our scheme of government?

I do not believe that the men who wrote our Federal Constitution ever dreamed that in coming years it would be given the narrow construction that some advocate—a construction that destroys its spirit and defeats the outstanding purpose for which it was adopted. We can by moderate use of public funds come to the relief of our starving people without doing violence to the letter or spirit of the Constitution. We should not hesitate to take this action in view of the unprecedented and nation-wide emergency.

Much has been said during the course of this debate about the suffering and want resulting from drought conditions. While conceding that suffering from drought is nation-wide and unprecedented, I repudiate the suggestion that the major part of the suffering and want which prevails in the United States is the result of drought conditions. For every man in the United States who is hungry as the result of drought conditions there are 10 men who are hungry as the result of economic conditions, which are the inevitable outgrowth of our pernicious and inequitable economic system which for 30 years has bled the common people of their substance, imposed on them an ever-increasing and almost

unbearable burden of taxation, deprived them of the rewards of their honest toil, and reduced them to a condition of economic vassalage; a system that has caused an unfair and indefensible distribution of the wealth that annually accrues to the American people. We are now paying the penalty of a half century of special-privilege legislation. Our entire industrial system has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

In 1913 our national wealth was \$187,000,000,000, which we had been over 300 years in accumulating. From 1913 to 1921 our national wealth increased from \$187,000,000,000 to \$320,000,000,000, an increase of \$133,000,000,000 in eight years. This was the golden age of American agriculture, industry, commerce, and business. It was an era of unprecedented prosperity. The farmer, the manufacturer, the laborer, the merchant, the banker, men of all other vocations were full handed. Prosperity smiled on every vocational group.

In that short period of eight years we created almost as much national wealth as the American people had been able to accumulate in the three preceding centuries. Since 1921 our wealth has continued to increase until now it is approximately \$355,000,000,000, a sum that staggers human comprehension. Great personal and corporate fortunes that exceed the dreams of avarice have been built up. Our banks and our trust companies are overflowing with money, but little of it is available for loans. Yet, notwithstanding our great national wealth, which has made us the financial mistress of the world, notwithstanding our unique and beneficent form of government, notwithstanding the wise and sound principles upon which our Government is founded, we see those in power to-day standing mute and helpless, confessing their inability to act and the incapacity of our Government to meet and relieve a situation unparalleled in our national history. Emergency legislation of a wholesome and humane character, which has for its object the feeding of starving men, women, and children and is designed to relieve distress and suffering throughout the length and breadth of this land, is being vigorously opposed by the President and his party leaders, while famine infests wide areas and children cry for bread. If our Government has not the power to remedy this acute situation and relieve this appalling distress, if our form of government is so impotent, if it is so static, if it is so inelastic that we can not relieve this nationwide hunger by direct legislative action and by moderate appropriations from the Public Treasury, then, indeed, our benign and benevolent scheme of government has broken down and lost some of the luster that you and I fain would give it.

Hundreds of thousands of sober, industrious, honest, and deserving men and women, tillers of the soil, have, through no fault of their own, by drought conditions, been reduced to penury and starvation. I say they must not go unfed. And in the industrial districts and in the great centers of wealth and population millions of honest, industrious, and deserving men and women are out of employment, many walking the streets seeking any kind of work and begging for bread. The wolf stands at the door of millions of homes where heretofore want was unknown. This unemployment is all-inclusive and nation-wide. By the cruel decree of an unsympathetic destiny all vocational groups have contributed to this grand army of the unemployed. In fancy I can see the outstretched hands of undernourished children, and I can hear the appeal of millions who will tonight go to bed hungry.

Is our Government in such a rigid strait-jacket and so inflexible and helpless and impotent it can not relieve a situation that appeals mightily to the conscience and sympathy of even the most callous hearts?

Our scheme of government must meet the test of present-day conditions. Ours is a rapidly changing and exceedingly complicated economic life. A government is a failure if it confesses its impotence and inability to relieve the hunger and suffering of its citizens who are the helpless victims of calamitous conditions over which they had no control. In

this land of incalculable wealth shall it be said that our Government can not come to the relief of its suffering citizens and provide all necessary relief by direct legislative action? Is ours a government that functions in the summer of prosperity but is impotent in the winter of want? Shall men, women, and children who are in no manner to blame go hungry and undernourished because, forsooth, some shallow-brained champion of special-privilege legislation inaccurately charges that national bounty is a dole?

Shall a government that extracts from the pockets of the people four or five billion dollars annually hesitate to appropriate a few paltry millions to feed its famished people, who, without fault, have been reduced to penury by the stern, rigorous, and relentless forces of nature traveling in the somber and lugubrious garb of drought, flood, and storm, and adverse economic conditions?

What is wrong in the United States? Why these millions of unemployed? Why has our boasted industrial and economic systems failed us at the very time we were told they were invulnerable? Why does nation-wide want and nation-wide economic distress follow rapidly in the footsteps and so quickly overtake nation-wide prosperity? The answer is obvious. We have built our economic system on a false basis. Our colossal industrial structure has been reared on an unsound foundation. The so-called protective-tariff system is based on legislative favoritism. The manufacturing classes have been made beneficiaries of special-privilege legislation. This system has enriched the manufacturer at the expense of the farmer and consuming public. It has sapped the substance of the many in order to unconscionably augment the profits of the favored few. The American people have been bled white by this selfish, sordid, and cynical industrial system.

It has levied a heavy tribute on everything the farmer buys. It is ever widening the spread between what the farmer gets for his commodities and what he pays for his supplies. It has destroyed the buying power of the masses in general and the farmers in particular. It has been largely responsible for the shrinkage of our agricultural wealth of \$27,000,000,000 between 1920 and 1925, and which shrinkage is still in progress.

The principal cause of our unemployment is found in the impoverishment of the agricultural classes, who were the best customers for mill and factory made products. In bearing down too heavily on the farmer, the manufacturer and big business men have killed the goose that lays the golden eggs. You can not reduce the agricultural classes to a condition of peasantry without destroying their purchasing power. If the farmer is full handed and prosperous, he buys the manufacturing products, and all other vocational groups share in his prosperity.

But some one shouts, "Start the factories; open the mills; start the wheels turning and begin producing manufactured commodities."

There can be no return of prosperity to the industrial classes until there has been a rehabilitation of agriculture. Under the existing system the agricultural classes are denied social justice and a fair proportion of our annual increase in our national wealth. There will be no solution of the industrial and unemployment problem until there is a just solution of the farm problem. So long as we deny to agriculture economic equality with industry we delay the return of an enduring and nation-wide prosperity.

There has been an overproduction not only by factories but of factories, and through labor-saving devices man power has been penalized and the demand for laborers reduced to a minimum. Not only have the number of factories been unreasonably multiplied, but the productivity of practically every factory unit substantially increased. Some persons who are qualified to speak are of the opinion that 60 per cent of the factories in the United States, working 6 days a week for 6 or 8 months in a year can produce more manufactured commodities than the American people can consume or find a market for in 12 months of the year. Of course, this is because of mass production, labor-saving

equipment, ever-increasing efficiency of American labor, and its greater productivity.

So, my friends, while time will not permit me to discuss this matter in detail, it is very evident that there must be a complete readjustment of our industrial life and the restoration of a proper balance between the industrial classes on the one hand and the agricultural and consuming groups on the other hand before the problem of unemployment can be solved or an enduring prosperity ushered in.

I frequently hear the statement that we are emerging from this nightmare of unemployment, and that prosperity is just around the corner. I am sorry I can not so read the signs of the times. I may be a dull student of present conditions, but I am unable to find any substantial evidence that a return of prosperity is imminent. We are in the morning dawn of a long period of unemployment and not in its evening twilight.

As I see the situation we are now entering upon one or, perhaps, two decades of unemployment. It is the inevitable outgrowth of our lopsided, jug-handle, economic system, under which factories have been unreasonably multiplied, and the productivity of our manufacturing plants tremendously increased.

By legislative favoritism our industrial activities have been artificially and unduly stimulated for more than a generation. This has destroyed the balance between manufacturing and other great basic industries, and drawn to the industrial centers an undue proportion of the Nation's man power. This has resulted in the building of too many factories and the production of a supply of manufactured commodities far in excess of the consumptive capacity of the American people or our foreign markets.

We have reached the saturation point in industrial products. The factories are making more commodities than can be consumed in America or sold abroad, even if good times return and the purchasing power of the people is restored. These conditions spell a transition which, in my opinion, will last at least a decade. I do not mean to say that employment conditions will not improve for a decade, but I do assert that the period of transition or readjustment will last at least 10 years, during which time I look for the fluctuating conditions that always attend a transition from one economic or industrial state to another.

Five or ten years from now some of you or your successors will be wrestling with the problem of unemployment. As a result of multiplying the number and productivity of our industrial plants we are going to produce each year more manufactured commodities than can possibly be consumed in our domestic markets or for which we can find a market abroad. In the United States we have reached and passed the point of saturation in our industrial life. This has been true only recently. Until recent years the output from our manufacturing plants was not largely in excess of domestic consumption, and for our surplus we readily found a market abroad. This was especially true in the periods during which we engaged in the stupendous yet profitable task of developing our natural resources, when we were tunneling the mountains, reclaiming the desert, felling our forests, opening our mines, bridging turbulent streams, building cities, constructing railroads, and stirring the soil into generous productivity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. There was a time when we could consume all of the products of our mills and factories, but we have multiplied the productive power of our industrial plants to such an extent that for the next 10 or 20 years, unless there is a slowing down, we will be able to produce two or three times as many manufactured commodities as can be consumed in the American market or sold abroad.

No one who seeks to accurately read the signs of the times, no one who carefully studies present conditions can logically reach the conclusion that we are passing out of

the period of unemployment. I regretfully say that the readjustment period of our industrial life will extend over one and possibly two decades, during which the American people will be plagued by the problem of unemployment. A solution of the unemployment problem involves and depends on a just solution of the agricultural question. By this I mean there must be a restoration of a proper balance between industry and agriculture—a settlement that is fair to one and not unfair to the other great basic industry.

My colleagues, the American Government is standing now at the crossroads. Shall it be said that it is impotent and powerless to grant relief to our starving people? Shall it be said that our form of government is so static, inflexible, and inelastic that it can not meet this emergency? Should not our great Government glory in the opportunity to extend the helping hand to its afflicted people?

Some speak slightly about the Government of England, Germany, France, Italy, and other European States, and boast of the superiority of our scheme of government, yet let it be said to the credit of those nations, though bowed down by an unbearable burden of taxation, economic disaster facing them upon every hand, yet their form of government is so elastic and is so humane that they came quickly to the relief of their hungry and suffering men and women.

Their governmental structures may not be as idealistic as ours, but they use their governments when necessary to relieve distress. They utilize their governments as humane agencies while we hide behind a harsh and forced construction of our Constitution, thereby drying up the milk of human kindness in our national life.

By appropriation of necessary funds from the Public Treasury we do not do violence to the Constitution, abandon our national ideals, or establish a dangerous precedent, because only in extraordinary emergencies like the present one will it become necessary for the Federal Government to act.

Some of you gleefully voted \$160,000,000 rebate of income taxes. The beneficiaries of this rebate were largely men of stupendous fortunes. That was worse than a dole; it is a bounty to the rich and mighty. A few years ago many of you who oppose this emergency legislation voted to refund eighty or ninety million dollars in estate taxes. That was worse than a dole; that was a bounty, a gift out of the Treasury of the United States for individuals and corporations who were rich and did not need it.

But when suffering hangs like a pall over the Nation, when want stalks abroad throughout the land, when empty bellies are crying for food, when millions of men and women are out of employment and starving, we behold the amazing spectacle of Government officials, Congressmen, and Senators standing motionless, with their arms folded, arguing that our form of government is so ironclad, is so static, is so inelastic, so inflexible, so sordid, and so bloodless that we can not appropriate any Government funds to relieve the misery, hunger, and suffering of our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I favor, if necessary, liberal and reasonable appropriations out of the Treasury of the United States to feed the starving men, women, and children without regard to their race or religion, and if our Government is not able to function in this manner, if it is not able to come to the rescue of its own starving citizens, then let us no longer claim that it is the most benevolent and beneficent form of government devised by the mind of man. A nation that can not take care of its own children, a nation that will stop its ears to the cry of hungry men, women, and children, a nation that is so devoted to the letter of the law that it fails to catch its spirit, a state that is so money mad and sordid that it can find no way to relieve distress, has certainly failed to perform the essential function of a just government, namely, to establish social justice and promote the comfort and happiness of its citizenry. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, since coming to the House, some two months ago,

I have refrained from trespassing upon the valuable time of the House because I thought a new Member ought to listen. However, a situation has arisen with reference to the proposed legislation to pay the adjusted-service certificates of the veterans, and I feel I ought to take just a few minutes and express some opinions I have on the subject. But before doing so I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for according me this opportunity to say a few words.

The main action in the great battle for payment of the adjusted-service certificates is now in full swing. The enemy has unlimbered its heavy artillery from the Treasury and laid down a panic barrage on the House and Senate sectors of the Capitol. Behind this barrage the enemy infantry is deploying from banks, stock brokers' offices, and editorial rooms firing alarmist statements and editorials as it rushes to drive home the attack.

How reminiscent of the fight for the adjusted compensation law in 1924 this battle scene must appear to the observer who watches from the side lines. Only those well-paid mercenaries, the "Veterans' Antibus League," are missing from the fray.

It is the same old artillery, the same old infantry that thundered so fearfully and failed so ingloriously in the adjusted-compensation fight of 1924. Even its ammunition has the old sound and fury. The battered Mellon battery, charged with dire threats of billion-dollar deficits, is again booming along the congressional front on the Potomac. The duds of this old battery lie strewn in heaps upon the field of 1924 and not one has burst yet. In this fight the shells are larger and whiz more loudly. The hope of the enemy is that they will, by their fearful sound alone, shatter the morale of those obstinate deluded Senators and Congressmen who foolishly believe that this great Republic ought to pay its debt to the veterans and who are rash enough to stand in the trenches and fight for them.

Thousands and hundreds of thousands of veterans of the World War are walking the streets without food, without shelter, without employment, and well-nigh without hope. They hold in their hands a beautifully engraved certificate, the symbol of their Government's solemn promise to pay them a debt which it has owed for over a decade. During that decade their country, for which they risked everything that men hold dear, paid in princely sums that beggared the fabulous hoard of Cræsus of old every other debt it owed. It paid the civilian worker, it paid the railroads, aye, it paid the profiteer. It forgave the debt of billions owed it by foreign governments, it poured out untold millions to relieve the suffering and distress of strange peoples in far-away lands. It did all this with a magnificent largess far surpassing that of any potentate of ancient or medieval days. It wiped the slate clean except for its own true, faithful defenders, the veterans of the World War.

Through 10 years of patient hope these uncomplaining heroes of the Nation have waited for justice. Through 10 wonderful years when this great rich land of ours literally overflowed with milk and honey from the horn of plenty they waited, waited, waited for their turn to come. The vaults of our Treasury were bursting with such a hoard of gold as never before known in the long recorded time of men and nations. In the midst of all this unprecedented wealth the humble veterans have never lost confidence in their Government. In their hour of need, in their day of distress they have never doubted she would do for them, her defenders, what she had so often done for others less worthy of her bounty.

But no! The guardian of her Treasury shuts the door in their faces and cries aloud against them. He summons the country to witness that if these men receive their due, invested wealth will suffer and stocks and bonds will fall in the money markets of the world. And that would be a grievous fault.

Mr. Chairman, why this solicitude for invested wealth every time the soldier raises his voice to ask for justice—belated justice? Can not wealth yield just a little of its great store to measure out to these men their just due? Must the dis-

tinguished Secretary of the Treasury always turn a deaf ear to their honest appeal for equity in order that he may continue to win the accolade of applause on change and in the market place?

A few days after I entered the Congress I introduced a bill to pay the adjusted-service certificates in cash at their face value. No veteran asked me to do this. No organization of veterans threatened me that if I did not do it they would work to defeat me. My action was purely voluntary and a clear exercise of my own free will after mature consideration. There were several reasons for my action which I felt then, and feel even more strongly now, fully warranted the course I took. Those reasons prompted me to sign the petition for consideration of this legislation by the Ways and Means Committee, which consideration is now in progress in that committee. As a member of the American Legion and a past department commander of Rhode Island, I urged the national executive committee of the Legion to clarify its position on this important matter because it was being erroneously proclaimed on the floor of this House that the American Legion was opposed to the payment of these certificates in cash.

That has now been done, and the country knows that every veteran organization of World War veterans is in favor of this legislation. In taking this position the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion but reflect the overwhelming sentiment of the individual members of those organizations, and of even greater numbers of veterans not affiliated with either.

This is no petty partisan, political maneuver initiated by a bloc of partisan Members of Congress. This is a cause in which millions are enlisted and every State and Territory of this great Union is represented among those millions. The order now is clear the way.

The terrible and dire things which Mr. Mellon predicts be upon our heads and not on his. I am altogether willing to share the responsibility for all that may flow from this legislation. I am supremely confident that it will be more of good than of evil, not only for the veterans but for their fellow citizens in every walk of life—yes; even for those whose financial welfare is the Secretary of the Treasury's first care.

I speak advisedly. I know how fearful of the future men of business and finance are at this critical time. They fear inflation because they know now that it was the reckless, unwarranted inflation of 1928 and 1929 for political window-dressing purposes that produced our present economic woes. Their fears in this respect are justified, and they have a right to demand that never again shall any political party place them in such jeopardy to serve the selfish ends of party. They see clearly now the evil results of inflation and false prosperity; but what they do not see is that the business world is now suffering from an extra dose of deflation. The pendulum has swung too far.

Something must be done to readjust the balance but that something must be heroic. No faltering, hesitant groping will do. Unless heroic action is taken the return back to normal will continue its present slow and painful course. This is what the wise and worth-while business forecasts are saying between the lines for those who have the wit to read them aright. Some of the forecasters, indeed, express a fear of too quick recovery, but this fear is quite unwarranted now in view of the long period of 16 months of consecutive deflation through which we have already passed. Some inflation now would not be inflation in the real sense. It would amount to nothing more than a sensible reduction of a wholly unjustified extreme of deflation. The payment of the adjusted-service certificates affords an ideal method at hand to effect this necessary and desirable result. This Congress should enact this legislation now and thereby do justice to the veteran and remove the present feeling of uncertainty in the business world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter which I received from the Providence Chamber of Commerce, resolutions adopted by the chamber, and my answer thereto.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I object to the resolutions.

Mr. CONDON. The resolutions are against the proposed compensation bill.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I do not care what they are against, I object to them.

Mr. CONDON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in the extension of my remarks the letters referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

THE PROVIDENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Providence, R. I., January 31, 1931.

HON. FRANCIS B. CONDON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: By direction of the board of directors of the Providence Chamber of Commerce I am inclosing herewith a copy of resolutions adopted by the board at a special meeting held Friday, afternoon, January 30.

The board expresses the sincere hope that you will use your best influence for the defeat of legislation involving such vast expenditures as are proposed in the various bills now before Congress relating to the veterans' adjusted-service certificates.

Very respectfully yours,

RICHARD B. WATROUS,
General Secretary.

FEBRUARY 3, 1931.

RICHARD B. WATROUS,

General Secretary the Providence Chamber of
Commerce, Providence, R. I.

MY DEAR MR. WATROUS: I have received your letter of January 31, together with the resolutions of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, requesting my aid in opposing the passage of various bills now before the Congress relating to veterans' adjusted-service certificates.

I introduced a bill on December 8, 1930, providing for the payment of the adjusted-service certificates at their face value, and therefore I can not comply with your request to oppose such legislation.

Until I received your letter and resolutions yesterday I had not received a single protest against my position on this very important subject, despite the fact that the widest publicity had been given to my action and that I had personally spoken twice in Rhode Island in favor of paying these certificates. On the contrary, my mail has been filled with favorable indorsements of such legislation, both by veterans and nonveterans, and many of the letters contain the most heart-rending pleas for aid and assistance. I have also been approached personally by business men in my own district who have told me that they favor this legislation and believe that it would be of assistance in reviving business. In view of these facts I am somewhat at a loss to understand the rather tardy protest of your board of directors, unless it is a response to the article written by Mr. Ashmun Brown, which appeared in the Journal of Friday, January 30, wherein he quoted Frank Kent, of the Baltimore Sun, who had written that business men had failed to raise their voice in protest against the payment of the adjusted-service certificates. The action of your board follows so closely upon the publication of this alarmist dispatch from Washington that it leads one almost to the conclusion that this dispatch was the cause of your action. This may be a mistaken conclusion, but in any event you will agree with me that both are so closely timed that the public is entitled to some explanation.

There is one other point in your resolutions and your letter which, if you will permit me, I desire to comment upon, and that is your statement that this legislation is vicious in principle. It is a matter of deep regret to me that I sat in the Ways and Means Committee room of the House of Representatives yesterday and heard your resolutions read into the records of that committee containing that attack on legislation designed to help men whose only offense is that they are trying to obtain the payment by their Government of a just debt which is owed to them. This legislation is the very opposite of vicious legislation. It may appear to some to be unwise, impolitic, or imprudent at this time, and those who express such opinions of it are entitled to respect, but by no stretch of argument could it be termed vicious. I resent, not only for myself but on behalf of many thousands of veterans of the World War in our State, your characterization of this legislation as vicious. I feel that the chamber of commerce owes an apology to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all other veterans of Rhode Island who are supporting the passage of this legislation. These men are not the type of citizens who would ask the Congress of the Nation, which they fought to defend, to pass vicious legislation in their behalf or on the behalf of anyone.

I have given some thought to this whole matter from the viewpoint of the ends to be served by this legislation, and also the economic and financial implications involved in it, and I want to assure the members of your organization that if this legislation could be properly termed vicious I would have nothing to do with

it. Reasonable men may differ as to the wisdom or prudence of paying this vast sum of money to the veterans at this time, but such difference of opinion is a matter of policy, and not a matter of principle.

All men in business and finance are not agreed that the payment of these certificates would be harmful at this time, and in this connection may I call to your attention an article which appeared in the Merchant's View column of the financial section of the New York Times of Sunday, February 1, 1931, where in the course of the article the statement is made:

"On the bonus question the ideas entertained in the ranks of business are somewhat in contrast to those emphasized by eminent banking authorities. While the more conservative business elements agree that in its final results the payment of a huge sum to the veterans would probably react unfavorably, there are also not a few who feel that the diversion of these funds to consumption channels might be the very thing needed to speed recovery."

May I also call to your attention that while the payment of some \$3,000,000,000 to the veterans will result in a certain degree of inflation, there are sound financiers and distinguished economists who believe that such inflation is precisely what the business and financial world needs. For a period of over 16 months now we have been passing through the most severe and prolonged period of deflation in our economic history, so that the present deflation appears to many sound observers to be as extreme and unwarranted as the inflation in the summer of 1929. In other words, the pendulum has swung too far and something must be done to readjust the balance and restore a more normal condition. On this point may I call your attention to a most informative and interesting article in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, October 22, 1930, by Mr. T. B. Macaulay, president of the Sun Life Assurance Co., of Canada. In that article, Mr. Macaulay states:

"We are suffering from excessive deflation, and it is again in the power of the Federal reserve directors to render a great national service. It is certainly as important to prevent disastrous deflation and repression as it was to prevent undesirable inflation."

To prevent this deflation he recommended the purchase of \$500,000,000 of bonds by the Federal reserve bank and by virtue of that policy a vastly beneficial influence would begin to assert itself in the money market. He cited in support of his suggestion the opinion of Prof. Gustav Cassel, of the University of Stockholm, who is regarded by many as the foremost living economist. Professor Cassel gave his support to such a policy as above outlined in an opinion which he gave to the League of Nations on the world economic policy of 1920-21. A quotation from the remarks of Professor Cassel may be found in the Wall Street Journal of November 14, 1930, in the body of a second article by Mr. Macaulay.

I cite the above facts merely to show that there are sound financiers and economists who firmly believe that the business world is now greatly in need of some inflation just as in the summer of 1929 it was badly in need of much deflation. Therefore if \$3,000,000,000 of Government bonds to pay the adjusted-service certificates are issued, it will not be an unmitigated evil because it will produce inflation, but it will rather be a pronounced good because of the need of some inflation.

Whether or not business will be greatly benefited by the payment of these certificates no one can deny that our Government owes a debt to the veterans of the World War, which Congress has acknowledged, and which is 10 years old. Many thousands and hundreds of thousands of these veterans are in great distress. They are without employment; they are in bread lines; they have been evicted from their homes; they have lost their farms; they have spent all their savings and are at last reduced to borrow from their Government on these certificates, and their Government charges them 6 per cent for the loan. Certainly these men are entitled to have their debt paid and not be required to pay interest to the Government. Certainly these men are justified in asking that the Government issue bonds to pay them, even though you and I and other investors may sacrifice a point or two on our holdings of bonds. Certainly invested wealth ought to be the last to complain against these men who guaranteed the security of invested wealth with the offer of their lives in 1917 and 1918.

I have written at this length to give you some idea how profoundly I hold to the opinion that the adjusted-service certificates should be paid in cash now, and to make clear to you that I honestly believe this legislation far from being vicious is an act of justice on the part of our Government toward the veterans and that it will prove to be of great benefit not only to them but to all their fellow citizens in every walk of life. I have the highest respect for the membership of the Providence Chamber of Commerce. I know many of your members personally and they are not only good men of business but they are also high-minded humanitarians. I am deeply sensible of the vast amount of good work that the Providence Chamber of Commerce has done and is doing to promote the economic welfare not only of Providence, but of the whole State of Rhode Island, and I may add to a large extent, New England. I can not, therefore, believe that your organization would willingly do harm to the service men of our State by casting aspersions upon the integrity of their motives in supporting this legislation. Inasmuch as your resolutions appeared in the newspapers of Saturday, January 31, 1931, I shall take the liberty of giving this answer to the press so that the public may know my position in the matter in response to your request to oppose this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS B. CONDON.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I realize the situation that gentlemen in charge of the bill are anxious to finish the bill before adjournment, and I shall not occupy all the time so generously allowed to me.

However, I feel that I am almost in duty bound to call the attention of the House to some marvelously changed conditions, as compared with conditions one year ago.

I recall that about one year ago I stood on this floor and proclaimed and exclaimed somewhat against the infamous gag rules by which the House is hobbled. At that time in some quarters I was damned from Dan to Beersheba, and I was called everything from a bolshevist to an anarchist.

But I have listened in recent days to the remarks of many gentlemen in and out of the House regarding the system of gag rule, and now I regard my remarks of one year ago as really too mild. At that time I recall that I referred to the chairman of our gag-rules committee as "my princely colleague from New York." To-day I heard a Member refer to him as the most damnable demagogue in the House, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, whom I had denominated "my princely colleague," replied in kind to the gentleman from Texas.

Oh, these are changed times, Mr. Chairman, but we are going to have a new House pretty soon, and I feel that however it may be organized, whether by the Democrats or by the Republicans, we will secure a measure of improvement over our existing gag-rule system.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly at this moment desire to call the attention of my colleagues and of the country to two situations which I think need the eye and the ear of the country. I particularly direct attention—and you will find it recorded in the proceedings of the Committee on Ways and Means of yesterday—I want to call your attention to the dramatic testimony offered there by a soldier, a little fellow not much larger than a midget, weighing 107 pounds, I think. I want to suggest that all my colleagues get one or more copies of his testimony, take it to your homes, let your home folks read it, or you read it to them, and I am quite sure that the country at large would have a better understanding of the unemployment situation and the instant need of favorable action by this "lame-duck" Congress in granting the plea of our World War veterans for immediate cash payment of their adjusted-service certificates.

The other matter about which I desire to direct attention, and which ought to receive serious consideration, is this: I have been told by Members of this House that during the past week they have received telephonic calls from high-pressure bond salesmen suggesting to the Members that the bonds they own may be seriously impaired if they shall go to the length of granting the request of the soldier boys of the country for cash payment of the certificates which they now hold.

Mr. Chairman, when a statement like that is made I feel that the Member ought to give his authority for it. I am going to act as personal authority for the statement I have made. A high-pressure bond salesman made the mistake of imagining that I own some bonds. How in the world he ever conceived that notion I do not understand. I never owned a bond in my life other than the Liberty bonds which I purchased through patriotic impulses during the war. I was called over the phone by this bond salesman and informed that if I should proceed in my course of advocating the payment of the World War veterans' certificates in cash, my own property must necessarily suffer. I am ashamed, Mr. Chairman, to admit that even a bond agent should approach me with a proposition of that kind. However, he approached me over the telephone, where I could not reach him. Had I been able to reach him I think there would have been a mutilated bond agent in Washington at this moment.

I do sincerely plead with my colleagues to procure a copy of the Ways and Means Committee hearings of yesterday afternoon, and carry home to their own people the stenographic story of the most remarkable and dramatic testi-

mony that I have ever heard given before a committee in the Congress of the United States. A reading of that story should shock to silence every citizen who has impeded passage of legislation to carry simple justice to every American boy who played a part in the World War.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to consume a great deal of time this afternoon in discussing a subject that is very near to my heart and one in which nearly 4,000,000 of World War veterans are interested. At a later date I do expect to ask the indulgence of the House to discuss at some length some of the proposed bills pending in Congress to pay all or a substantial part of the face value of the adjusted-service certificates of veterans of the World War.

I was interested in the splendid address of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD], who preceded me, especially his reference to the payment of the so-called "bonus" for veterans in cash. We have had a number of speeches favoring the proposition this afternoon, and no doubt many more will follow in the future. But let me suggest that it is action our veterans want, and action they must have, or else many of our destitute ex-service men and their wives and children are going to be hungry while Members of Congress make speeches eulogizing our men for their valiant services when this great Nation of ours was in distress.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] read a letter purported to have been written by a past Department Commander of the American Legion of that great State, opposing the payment of the adjusted-service certificates at this time by our Government, and I attempted to ask the gentleman a question but his time was so precious he did not afford me the opportunity. I desired to ask the gentleman from Connecticut if he really thought the sentiment expressed in that letter reflected the sentiment of the rank and file of the World War veterans of the State of Connecticut. I can not believe that it does. There may be a few ex-commanders and would-be dictators of the American Legion who are so rich that they fail to appreciate the critical predicament of thousands of their comrades, and who do not need to cash these promissory notes that Congress gave to our boys, when forced by public sentiment to pass some kind of legislation along this line back in 1924. If the financial depression is as serious in Connecticut as in Oklahoma, and if sentiment is as overwhelmingly in favor of the payment of these notes that our boys are holding against the Government, I do not hesitate to say that the letter read into the Record by the gentleman from Connecticut this afternoon could not possibly represent the sentiment of the rank and file of the people of his State.

I have been attending the hearings on this legislation before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives for the past several days. It was interesting to see the veteran Secretary of the Treasury and one of the wealthiest men of America, appear before that committee in opposition to any kind of favorable legislation. The veterans have not forgotten that Secretary Mellon has always been bitter in his opposition to this legislation or anything ever advocated by the ex-service men of America. Why, back in the year of 1919, when the American Legion convention went on record favoring some kind of adjustment of veterans' pay, Mr. Mellon was conspicuous by his opposition to any and all proposals. In order to defeat favorable legislation Secretary Mellon began to predict great deficits in the Treasury. He managed to fool the Congress for several years, but he yelled "Wolf" so often, and made so many bad guesses, and the demand for legislation became so insistent that Congress finally passed a bill over the President's veto in 1924.

I was also interested in a statement of the Undersecretary of the Treasury, a millionaire who, I understand, recently inherited \$25,000,000 more and who was referred to this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as the "official juggler of figures" in the Treasury Department. He, too, is horrified that the ex-soldiers in distress

throughout this country, through no fault of their own, have the temerity to come to Congress and ask that this Government pay them a debt it has owed them since the date of their discharge; a debt the Congress confessed in the year of 1924.

No doubt the Undersecretary of the Treasury, with his twenty-five millions, which he did not earn, will manage to drag along with his meager salary of \$10,000 per year with his swivel-chair job in the Treasury Department; but I am pleading for the needy ex-service men of America, many of whom are in hunger and distress at this moment. I am pleading, ladies and gentlemen, for the loyal and noble wives of these old soldier boys. I am pleading for the millions of hungry children; for the babies who are unable to speak for themselves and yet who are entitled to food and warm clothing this winter. This Government owes their daddies on an average of \$1,000 each, and yet men in authority, administration leaders both in and out of Congress, scoff at the pleas of our World War veterans that Congress pay them in cash, now, as it adjusted the pay of the railroads and steamship companies many years ago.

I have received many hundreds of letters, telegrams, and petitions from veterans in Oklahoma concerning this important legislation. These come from men of all walks of life including physicians, attorneys, ministers, railway trainmen, post-office clerks, postmasters, bankers, merchants, and farmers, and almost without exception the communications I have received have indorsed legislation to pay all, or a substantial part, of the face value of the adjusted-service certificates. I have here a few of these letters, petitions, and telegrams and will insert them in the Record. They speak for themselves.

The first communication I submit is from Hon. Jim Hatcher, of Chickasha, past department commander of the American Legion of the State of Oklahoma, which is proof that all past commanders do not assume the attitude of the one above referred to from Connecticut.

Space does not permit me to submit anything like all of the letters I have received within the past few days, nor may I make appropriate comment upon these communications I am submitting for publication in the Record; suffice to say, I am confident they express the sentiment of the people of the sixth congressional district of Oklahoma.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,

Congressman, House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JED: We have just had one of the largest Legion meetings in the history of our post. It was held last night, and there must have been 300 men present. We urged them all to come in because we wanted to take a vote on this compensation bill before Congress. We presented it from the standpoint of 50 per cent, 80 per cent, and the face value to be paid in cash now. Boys were here from Cement, Cyril, Ninnekah, Rush Springs, Bradley, Alex, Minco, Tuttle, Tabler, Blanchard, Verden, and Pocasset, and the matter was discussed very freely. Numbers of men gave their testimony as to their personal condition, and stated that they had been employed, but since the depression they were not only out of employment but had no funds. It seems that the greater part of the members of the American Legion and ex-service men are men who earn their living by manual labor.

I have always been against the payment of a bonus in cash that would amount to any great sum of money such as this, but, of course, no condition has ever arisen among World War veterans, except right after the war, similar to prevailing conditions now; and after talking to literally hundreds of fellows I have completely changed my mind, and I am absolutely in favor of paying the face value of these certificates in cash at this time. It is estimated that there is something like 4,000,000 ex-service men in the world to-day. They represent the producing element, and I believe that the Government could do nothing better than pay these policies, and at the same time this payment would not put the Government on record as being in favor of the dole system. No one who studies the economical conditions of countries, and particularly that of England, wants the dole system. The men who are unemployed in this country do not want money handed out to them as charity; what they want is a job.

The public-building program so far is not taking care of the situation; but I believe, if this adjusted compensation were paid in cash at this time, it would put enough money in circulation to provide for the poor class of people for several months, and by that time the different building programs that the municipalities, cities, towns, and the United States Government are putting over would tide them over this period of depression.

In my judgment the farmer is the hardest hit, excepting the laboring man who has been laid off and can't find a job. There

was not a single man in our meeting last night of some three hundred ex-service men in Grady County who expressed any opinion against this proposal. I believe you will do your just deserts and represent the citizens of this county pretty generally, and the ex-service men unanimously, by lending all the support you can to the passage of this measure for the face value in cash now.

I want to thank you for the wonderful work you did on the Kenmore case. I am satisfied that old man will be very happy and very grateful to you as long as he lives, because it was through your efforts that he received the compensation.

I want to congratulate you upon the excellent work you are doing for the ex-service men.

Sincerely your friend,

JIM HATCHER.

Mr. JED JOHNSON,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND JED: I received your letter of December 12 relative to payment of adjusted-service certificates.

I believe it would be a good thing for the veterans if they could receive at least half, if not all, of their certificates in cash at this time. I also think it would be a good thing if it were made optional. They could either draw the cash or carry the certificate, as they desired. There are a good many ex-service men who would not be forced to cash their certificates, while, on the other hand, there are hundreds who really need the money.

Since 1927, when the certificates were first eligible for borrowing purposes, this bank has been loaning continuously on them. With the exception of the City National Bank of Oklahoma City, it is our understanding that this bank has more money loaned on adjusted-service certificates than any other bank in Oklahoma. In view of this situation, we have come in more intimate contact with the ex-service men than anyone else, and we know the condition of a good many.

I trust you will be able to get some action on your bill.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

L. L. HUMPHREYS,
President Security National Bank.

JANUARY 10, 1931.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JED: I attended a Legion meeting at Chickasha, where I am a member, last night. One of the largest crowds I ever saw at a Legion meeting was present, as it was previously announced that a vote would be taken in regard to the payment of the soldiers' bonus certificates and the vote was unanimous in favor of payment in full for the certificates, and I find the same sentiment exists among the ex-service men of my community.

I believe you can render a great service to your buddies by supporting a bill in Congress to pay in full the certificates held by the ex-service men. I could give you a number of good reasons why, which you already know without my going into detail.

An answer to this letter is not requested, as I know you are a busy man and your time is limited; when you are not too busy a good letter will always be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

V. T. GONNAWAY,
Postmaster.

HARRY DOBBS POST, No. 55,
Duncan, Okla., February 3, 1931.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We are in receipt of your wire and your letters of recent date. We are also in receipt of your earlier letter in which you stated your position as to the adjusted-service certificates.

We can not express in too high terms the manner in which you are looking after the interests of the ex-service man, his dependents and orphans. If there were more such representatives of the people in Washington there would be no question but what we had a true representative form of government. You have succeeded admirably in bringing out the fact that you are in your present position for the sole purpose of expressing the desires of your constituents rather than to further any selfish motives.

The Harry Dobbs Post has a membership now of 507. Our highest membership heretofore was during the past year when we had about 575 members. At our meeting on January 26 we had a total of 600 ex-service men present of which over 500 were members of this post. At that time the post voted unanimously for payment of the adjusted-service certificates in cash now.

Again thanking you for your fine cooperation and with the best wishes of the post for your success in Washington, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK GOVIN, Adjutant.

GOLD EAGLE POST 247,
Canton, Okla., December 29, 1930.

At a regular meeting of Gold Eagle Post No. 247 American Legion, held at Canton, Okla., December 29, 1930, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas there are thousands of the World War veterans out of employment and many are in destitute circumstances; and

"Whereas the passage of an act of Congress paying in full our adjusted-compensation certificates would be a relief to our distressed buddies: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Gold Eagle Post, No. 247, do hereby most earnestly petition the Hon. JED JOHNSON, our Representative in Congress, and our Senators ELMER THOMAS and W. B. PINE that they work for and secure the passage of such a law during this present term of Congress.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Hon. JED JOHNSON and Senators ELMER THOMAS and W. B. PINE."

A. F. BRICKMAN, Commander.
FRANK BARNES, Adjutant.
C. W. WIESE, Past Commander.

MARLOW, OKLA., January 6, 1931.

Mr. JED JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JED: After reading several of Mr. Mellon's excuses for not paying in cash the veterans' certificates now that are due in 1945, just wanted to write you regarding the opinion that people in this section of the country have in general and mine in particular.

In the first place, it would seem to the small outsider, that for the general good of the country, and especially those in power in our Government, that it would be well for this payment to be made in cash at this time, for it is the only way in the world that the Government can distribute money at this time that would reach every corner of the United States in the manner that this would. The papers mention that it is a fine and wonderful thing for the Government to spend several hundreds of millions at this time in public buildings and road work, and if as much money was spent in this manner as the bonus certificates amounted to, not one-fourth of 1 per cent of the people would have a direct chance at one of these dollars, as compared to the payment referred to.

I believe it is entirely possible that Mr. Mellon is so rich that he can not fully appreciate what \$600 to \$1,000 each would mean to the ex-service man and what it would really mean to the country, and especially at a time when bonds issued for this purpose could be sold in the open market at a much lower rate of interest than the present outstanding Liberty bond issues are carrying. It is my understanding that you introduced a bill for half payment of these certificates, and I would certainly be glad if this could be withdrawn and one introduced for full payment and insisted on with all the power you have, and with that that you can muster among your friends.

Yours very truly,

C. P. MCKINNEY,
Cashier State National Bank.

EL RENO POST, No. 34, AMERICAN LEGION,
El Reno, Okla.

Resolution

Whereas the prevailing depression which has come upon our Nation has reached such proportions that millions of our citizens are in financial distress; and

Whereas numbered among those who are in difficult straits due to unemployment and lack of financial aid are thousands of World War veterans who sacrificed their time, position, and health in the momentous struggle in 1917 and 1918; and

Whereas the Government has issued bonus certificates to all such veterans which can not be converted into cash under the present plan until 1945; and

Whereas the present emergency is of such a serious nature that the passage of legislation by Congress authorizing the immediate cashing of these bonus certificates at face value would relieve much of the distress now prevailing and enable the ex-service men to weather the present crisis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That El Reno Post, No. 34, of the American Legion, petitions and urges that the national Congress immediately enact such legislation and vote such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out this payment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to all Oklahoma Senators and Representatives now in Congress, and to the department and national headquarters of the American Legion.

[SEAL.]

EL RENO POST, No. 34, AMERICAN LEGION,
By DEWEY PALMER, Commander.

Attest:

GUY C. KNARR, Post Adjutant.

APACHE, OKLA., November 25, 1930.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We called a meeting of the ex-service men and started a move to have them to petition Congress to pay their bonus off at this session. If you can get this over, it will help the present oppression very much, as these boys are scattered over the country and will place it in circulation in every community. The boys here think it will be best to have this optional with the policyholder, let them that want to cash in, and them that had rather keep it, do so.

Many of these boys who gained the victory and set the world free for democracy are now in a very great need and can't make it through the winter without help.

Excuse me for this lengthy letter. I am a preacher and an aged man, but I am sure interested in this matter very much.

G. W. PARMER.

Whereas due to the depressed economic condition existing throughout the country, thousands of World War veterans are in straightened financial circumstances; and

Whereas, their financial condition could be relieved by the Government paying all adjusted-compensation certificates in full: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Liberty Post No. 206, of the American Legion, That it go on record as favoring the passage of an act by Congress authorizing the payment of all adjusted-compensation certificates in full: Be it further

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be urged to initiate and press the passage of such an act during this session of Congress: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our representatives in Congress.

Done in open meeting on this 11th day of December, 1930.

O. F. LEITNER,
Post Commander.

Attest:

H. H. DETERMAN, Adjutant.

WATONGA, OKLA., December 18, 1930.

Hon. JED JOHNSON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find petition with the names of 100 ex-service men who are anxious and favorable toward the payment of their adjusted-compensation certificates at this time.

This post at its regular meeting Tuesday, December 16, went on record as being favorable to this idea also.

Have checked with the business men, chamber of commerce, Kiwanis, and other clubs and the consensus of opinion is that this should be done now, for it will give those boys who benefit from this payment an opportunity to pay up old debts and in a measure perhaps get square with the world for a while.

In our county particularly approximately 80 per cent have been forced to borrow on their certificate, with nothing to do but repeat this each year. This does not give them much chance for gain on this certificate, and by the time the certificate is due and payable in 1945 a great many of these boys will have "gone west."

Other posts in the county are in favor of payment at once in as large a percentage as possible, being heartily in favor of payment at face value at maturity, but more than willing to take as low as 80 per cent value now.

One question that has arisen in the argument on this matter is, Should it be paid off now at 80 per cent, what would become of the balance of the amount the certificate calls for which is payable in 20 years? Would this be lost to the holder of the certificate or would he receive this at the end of the allotted time the certificate runs?

The signers of this petition are all members of the American Legion, and as a post, this post goes on record for this payment now.

Trusting you will be successful in your endeavors to get this thing done right, we are,

Very truly yours,

WOODROW WILSON POST, No. 125, WATONGA, OKLA.
By O. L. KILLIE, County Commander.

NINNEKAH, OKLA., January 10, 1931.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Congressman from the Sixth District Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JED: Pertaining to the adjusted compensation act now before Congress and the condition of the ex-service men of the sixth district and in general over the State of Oklahoma.

I myself think that payment in full is no more than just, for at this critical time there are a great many of the boys thrown out of work and the farmers are in destitute circumstances, and in a great many of these cases they are boys who did their bit over there; and if ever they needed help, they need it now, for I tell you, Jed, times are hard in Oklahoma.

Homes are in danger of being lost on account of mortgages coming due and no money to meet this emergency; no way of getting it, as there is no work, no income, starvation facing many families, and believe me, Jed, it is hard to see your loved ones needy and suffering. Therefore something should be done immediately to relieve this situation, and by putting this law into effect now I believe it can be done—providing they pay off now when the need is most urgent.

If this bill should go into effect at once, it would be the greatest help, financially, Oklahoma has ever known. This matter should be taken care of now; not next year, but now, in this time of stress and need.

Another thing we should take into consideration is the boys in the hospitals and their families. They could use the cash now, as it is doing them no good where it is. Why not put this money in circulation where it is needed and can do the most good?

Very truly yours,

H. M. E. GLIDDEN,
R. R. No. 1, Box 105, Ninneka, Okla.

CHICKASHA, OKLA., January 20, 1931.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Congressman Sixth District Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: Your letter of January 13 received in reply to mine of recent date regarding payment of adjusted-service certificates.

May I thank you most kindly for the prompt reply, consideration, and information furnished me.

Regarding different bills pending on this subject, may I say that while, of course, we the ex-service men feel that we would like to be paid in full the face value of these certificates as of 1945, however, if we can not get this will have to be satisfied to take what we can get though it be 80 per cent paid in cash or even lower.

Relative to your pending bill to pay 50 per cent in cash, the balance at maturity. May I say this meets with my approval and it is to be preferred to the one mentioned in your letter introduced by Hon. JOHN GARNER.

I again express my appreciation for the assistance you have rendered us. I beg to remain,

Respectfully, your friend,

EARL H. WARD.

KINGFISHER, OKLA., December 29, 1930.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Representative Sixth District Oklahoma.

DEAR JED: It is hardly necessary to write a Legionnaire enlisting his services in aid of a measure to pay the veterans in cash now the full value of their certificates.

Both the dictates of justice and the dire necessities of depression demand relief for those boys who served their country for a mere pittance in the dark hours of need.

Besides it would help the civilian equally as much in the drought-stricken parts of the country. No part of the country is exempt from a shortage of currency and burden of past-due obligations and delinquent taxes. The Congress has the power and should use it to issue non-interest-bearing full legal-tender notes to the amount of this veteran indebtedness. I would call them "Victory notes" because it would mean victory over depression, put life and vitality into the corpse of public and private credit.

J. WRIGHT SAIN.

CHICKASHA, OKLA.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Representative Sixth District.

DEAR JED: As I am an ex-service man of the World War, I am very much interested in the conditions of our country which exist at present time, and also in your proposal to pay the adjusted-service certificates now.

I attended a meeting January 9 at our Legion post, with about 350 ex-service men present. A vote on the full payment bill carried by 100 per cent. I find that all of the veterans are in favor and in need of the cash on these certificates now. This legislation will not only help the veterans but it will help the entire country as well. It will give the veterans a chance; an opportunity which they have never had before; a chance to invest this much cash in a little home of their own, where they may reside, to make a comfortable place for their families. Not only that, it will take hundreds of men off the State highways who are wandering from place to place looking for employment and none to be found. They are compelled to beg their food from the back doors of many homes, at the same time knowing if they had the cash on the certificates which they hold all of this could be avoided.

CLINTON L. EWELL,
302 North Fourth Street, Chickasha, Okla.

KINGFISHER, OKLA., January 29, 1931.

Congressman JED JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion post and citizens of Kingfisher appreciate your splendid work to bring proposal to pay bonus certificates to hearing and urge you to give this measure all possible pressure to secure victory. We will appreciate any favorable news.

KEITH LOWERY, Post, No. 5.

RUSH SPRINGS, OKLA., January 28, 1931.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Rush Springs Post, No. 80, in special meeting Tuesday, unanimously indorsed bill to pay adjusted-service certificates in full. The cost will be no greater now than in 1945, and the small payment to the boys now would benefit many who will not be here then.

DAVE ROBERTS, Post Commander.

WALTERS, OKLA., December 16, 1930.

Hon. JED JOHNSON:

Walters Post unanimously votes for program as outlined, and stands whole-heartedly behind your efforts.

AMERICAN LEGION POST No. 155.
E. OLIVER, Commander.

RYAN, OKLA., January 30, 1931.

Congressman JED JOHNSON,
Care Capitol:

The American Legion post of Ryan, Okla., passed resolution last night favoring the soldiers' bonus bill now before the House, and urge you to support it in every way possible. Resolutions to follow.

L. L. WADE, Commander.

HON. JED JOHNSON,
Member of Congress:

At a good-roads meeting held at Temple Saturday night, with delegations from Hastings and Walters present, said meeting went on record recommending payment of adjusted-service compensation 100 per cent. Let us help those that served our country when we were in need. Never was there a better time to give financial aid to the buddies.

TEMPLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

HASTINGS, OKLA., December 16, 1930.

HON. JED JOHNSON:

Unanimous for 100 per cent compensation pay off.

EARL DAVIS ADJUTANT POST 272.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the last District appropriation bill which will be reported by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS]. He is being promoted, and is resigning the chairmanship of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of the District appropriation bill.

That chairmanship is probably the most difficult and most arduous of any position under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The objects for which the District bill appropriates are all about us. They are in closest proximity. Its beneficiaries are daily in intimate and personal contact with the members of the committee and the Members of the House, and sometimes their importunities are all but irresistible. The effect of the pressure for increased appropriations for the District government is shown by the fact that while the population of the District of Columbia increased from 437,000 in the census of 1920 to 485,000 in 1930, an increase of 11.3 per cent, the appropriations for the support of the District government have increased in that brief decade from \$15,000,000 in 1920 to the \$48,000,000 carried in this bill, an increase of 320 per cent.

It inevitably follows that in so vast an establishment, spending annually this enormous sum, disbursed through so many diverse activities, there must creep in from time to time some waste, some extravagance, perhaps some inefficiency. And it requires a strong hand, a competent supervising authority, a courageous executive to deal with the problems which arise in the allocation of the funds provided by this bill. The gentleman from Nebraska fulfills those requirements admirably. He is the ideal chairman. [Applause.] He has not hesitated to call to account or to check records of efficiency, or to give credit where credit was due. He has effected economies of expenditure, secured increased efficiency of service, and has displayed a knowledge of District affairs which at times approached omniscience. Of course it is inevitable that any man occupying this difficult position and charged with this thankless task must expect criticism, and he has received criticism in abundance.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. BLANTON. I indorse every word that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says about the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], and everyone who has served with him, I believe, knows that he is one of the most earnest, energetic, active, fearless Members we have on this floor. We have seen him tried time and time again when domineering interests and influences tried to sway him, but he could not be swayed from his path of duty.

Mr. CANNON. And I am glad to say that he could always depend upon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to cooperate with him in saving money and in effecting needed reforms.

It is characteristic of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] that he has met all such criticism with equanimity of spirit and an open mind, ready to consider any complaint or any protest on its merit. The local press is fond of referring to him as the czar, but such czarism as he has practiced has been established and maintained for the benefit of the taxpayers and the welfare of the citizens of Washington and the District of Columbia. It is a matter of regret to all of us that he is giving up the chairman-

TEMPLE, OKLA.

ship of this committee. He is one of the ablest, one of the most valuable, and one of the most useful Members of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, any revenue (not including the proportionate share of the United States in any revenue arising as the result of the expenditure of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and prior fiscal years) now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia, and, in addition, \$9,500,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be advanced July 1, 1931, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia, and the tax rate in effect in the fiscal year 1931 on real estate and tangible personal property subject to taxation in the District of Columbia shall not be decreased for the fiscal year 1932, namely:

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MAPES: On page 2, after line 14, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"SELECT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Those members of the Select Committee on Fiscal Relations, House of Representatives, appointed pursuant to House Resolution No. 285, Seventy-first Congress, who are Members elect to the Seventy-second Congress, or a majority of them, during the period from March 4 to December 31, 1931, inclusive, are hereby authorized to continue the investigations, and to have the authority and privileges provided in such House resolution. Any unobligated balance on March 4, 1931, in the allocation made to such select committee from the contingent fund of the House, under the authority of House Resolution 329, Seventy-first Congress, shall remain to the credit of such committee as continued hereby, to be paid out on the usual vouchers approved as now provided by law."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan some questions about it.

What facts additional to those that are known and recognized by every Member of this House who has served any length of time at all does the gentleman expect to gather that will be of any benefit to the Congress between now and next December? This is an old controversy, 30 years old, and all of us are thoroughly familiar with it. I doubt if there is a fact that the gentleman gathered in his investigations that was not already known to the gentleman and all of us older Members.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], of course, is very familiar with the situation and familiar with the facts. The gentleman aided the select committee with a very good statement, and what the gentleman intimates by his question is no doubt largely true, as far as men who have served on the Committee on the District of Columbia and men who have made a special study of this subject generally are concerned. However, the select committee has been charged with certain duties—one of them to determine the comparative tax burden of the people of the District of Columbia with that of people on the outside, and the other is to study the sources of taxation, as the resolution states, and to make such recommendations in the form of bills or otherwise, relating to these two subjects, as the committee sees fit.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not the gentleman been able to do that since last July?

Mr. MAPES. The committee feels that if there had not been some purpose in appointing the committee the resolution authorizing its appointment would not have been adopted.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to go along with the gentleman and I do not want to interfere. Of course the amendment is subject to a point of order but I do not intend to make it if there is any reason for it. Can the gentleman tell us

how much this extra vocational hearing will cost the people of the country?

Mr. MAPES. I am trying to answer the gentleman's question in full. This resolution authorizing the appointment of the select committee passed the House of Representatives as I recall it on the day before or the day of adjournment of the last session of this Congress. The select committee did not convene until the beginning of Congress, the first of December. The committee then held hearings during practically every day of the session prior to the holidays.

Mr. BLANTON. I know all of that. What I want to know is how much more it will cost?

Mr. MAPES. It will not cost anything more—or at least the committee hopes it will not cost any more than has already been provided for.

Mr. BLANTON. We gave the gentleman an additional appropriation the other day. Will it cost any more than that?

Mr. MAPES. We hope not.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman can assure us of that I should have no objection at all, although it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, there is no way of giving the gentleman any absolute assurance. All I can say is that it is the judgment of the committee that the committee's expense will be well within the resolution that was passed the other day.

Mr. BLANTON. How much is this special investigator from Michigan costing? How much salary is being paid him?

Mr. MAPES. That is a matter of record in the Clerk's office. I can assure the gentleman that it is not excessive.

Mr. BLANTON. What was he before he was employed by the committee?

Mr. MAPES. He was and is counsel for the Clearing House Association of the City of Detroit, and has had a good deal of experience in tax matters. I have seen at least one letter in which one of the tax men in another State said he does not think a better man in the United States could have been employed for this particular work.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have such confidence in the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. THATCHER. Reserving the right to object, I am in favor of the amendment, but what will be the total cost involved, probably?

Mr. MAPES. The committee asked, and the Committee on Accounts and the House adopted a resolution appropriating out of the contingent fund of the House not more than \$10,000 to pay the expenses of the select committee. The select committee, as I said, hopes to keep well within that allowance.

Mr. THATCHER. And complete its deliberations in time to report at the next session of Congress?

Mr. MAPES. Yes. The gentleman who is assisting the committee, referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], is trying to assemble some data, and the committee, of course, desires to make its report just as promptly as possible.

As I said, the committee assumes it would not have been appointed if it was not expected of it to assemble such data as it could and, if possible, get some additional facts to those which are already generally known by those who have made a study of this question. I will say for myself personally that I think that is a difficult thing to do.

Mr. THATCHER. Under the gentleman's amendment the present personnel of the committee will continue during the vacation, because of the reelection of its membership.

Mr. MAPES. Yes. All of the members of the committee are elected to the next Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this amendment meets with the approval of all the members of the select committee?

Mr. MAPES. The select committee by unanimous vote authorized the chairman to consult with the chairman of this subcommittee and to take such action, either by an

amendment to this bill or by a joint resolution, as seemed best for the continuance of the committee after the 4th of March, and after consulting with the gentleman from Nebraska this procedure was decided upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plumbing inspection division: For personal services, \$45,100; for temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors of plumbing and laborers for such time as their services may be required, \$5,000; two members of plumbing board at \$150 each; in all, \$47,580.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 4, line 5, strike out the sum "\$45,100" and insert "\$42,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services, \$220,230; temporary clerk hire, \$4,000; in all, \$224,230.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: On page 4, at the beginning of line 21, strike out the sign and figures "\$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$5,000, to be immediately available."

In the same line strike out the total "\$224,230" and insert "\$225,230."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Corporation counsel, including extra compensation as general counsel of the Public Utilities Commission, and other personal services, \$89,380.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Was provision made to take care of transportation for the corporation counsel?

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill carries an item for the purchase of a new automobile for the engineer commissioner, with the contemplation that the present engineer commissioner's automobile will be turned over to the corporation counsel's office for their use.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and installation of electric traffic lights, signals and controls, markers, painting white lines, labor, maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary in the judgment of the commissioners, including not to exceed \$1,800 for the purchase and exchange of two non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, \$80,100: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act, or that is now available, shall be expended for building, installing and maintaining street-car loading platforms and lights of any description employed to distinguish same.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice the bill carries a provision which forbids the building, even the maintenance, of street-car loading platforms and lights in the future. Is it the intentment of the committee that there shall be no further safety zones, with platform accommodations, for the protection of the traffic on street cars?

Mr. SIMMONS. That proviso has been carried in the bill for the last five years, and its history is this: The street highway department was paying for loading platforms such as that on Connecticut Avenue in front of the Mayflower Hotel, made out of concrete and granite, with electric lights. They were being paid for out of District funds. The committee felt that the street-railway people should pay for those loading platforms and that it was not the obligation of the taxpayers to do it. In order to prevent the expenditure of public funds for that purpose we have carried this clause for the last five years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I might have to take issue with the position of the committee that this is a matter solely for

the benefit of the street-car companies. In my home city—I do not know how general the practice is—the municipality erects those permanent concrete protection zones at its own expense, and it does not levy the expense upon the utility. These loading platforms are primarily for the benefit of those who use the street cars, and those who use the street cars represent the public. This character of prohibition will result in there not being any future permanent or temporary protection platforms erected.

Mr. SIMMONS. This prohibition does not prevent the street-car people from building those platforms.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is because it is not to their interest to erect them that they will not erect them. I think these loading platforms are really necessary for the people of the District who utilize the street cars, as I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not feel it is any more the duty of the public to furnish loading platforms for those who use the street cars than it is the duty of the public to furnish stations for those who use steam-railroad trains. I believe the Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction, authority, and power to compel the street-railway people to provide this service for their patrons at their own expense, and that this service should not be carried at public expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. Essentially, it is not for the benefit of the street-car companies; essentially, it is for the benefit of the public, and the public represents the residents of the District. If it is for the benefit of the public, then the expense should be borne by the public.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is quite obvious that the public is paying the street-car utilities of this city very adequately for the service they receive, and they ought not to be charged twice for it, in my opinion.

Mr. STAFFORD. In my opinion, if the city does not erect these safety zones there will not be sufficient interest on the part of the street-car companies to erect them out of their own funds. I am in favor of these protective zones. I never noticed this provision in the bill until to-day and I am taking issue with the position of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think this is a matter for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of the street-car companies. I do not care about moving to strike out this proviso with the small audience here, and yet I feel almost tempted to do so, because it is a matter so essentially for the benefit of the people of the District. In my home city we are obliged to erect permanent concrete platforms. The gentleman can see that the street-car company will not erect them and you are not directing that they shall erect them.

They will not be inclined to erect them because it does not occasion any liability on them if a person is mowed down by a passing automobile. The street-car company is not liable but the public suffers. I hope the gentleman will take my viewpoint, because I really think the public or the District should erect them where the District Commissioners think they should be erected. It has been only in the last two years that we have begun to erect them in my home city, and they have proven there very serviceable; and yet in my home city, bear in mind, under existing law, the street-car companies are obliged to pay for the pavement within 1 foot outside of the trackage.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is 2 feet here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I really think this proviso should not be included.

Mr. SIMMONS. This provision has been in the bill for the last five years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I never noticed it before. Can not the gentleman see the force of the position I have taken? It is largely a matter for the benefit of the public and not for the benefit of the street-car company.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. My opinion is that when the public anywhere is charged what the people of Washington are charged

for street-railway service, they are paying enough to be provided with this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the gentleman whether the Utility Commission, in any instance, has ordered one of these platforms to be erected by the street-car company?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know how they are erected. They are maintained all over the city by the street-car people. The wooden platforms with lights are maintained on all the heavy-traffic streets by the street-car people, but they devised the scheme of the cost of permanent construction being shifted from the street-car people to the District taxpayers.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what is done in my home city, and they are much superior in appearance to these temporary wooden platforms that we find on Pennsylvania Avenue. It may be proper on Pennsylvania Avenue to have them of a temporary nature, so they will not be in the way in case of parades, but on Connecticut Avenue, where that highway is not used for parades, there should be permanent safety platforms, in my opinion. Will the gentleman resist a motion to strike this out?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I would be compelled to resist that. This is a matter that the committee has very thoroughly gone into on a number of occasions.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman in his district in Nebraska any safety platforms of this character?

Mr. SIMMONS. Such as they have here?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; if the gentleman will read the Washington Post he will see that I come from a city that has a population of eight thousand and some, almost 9,000 now, and I am not supposed to know anything about a city.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, but the gentleman has been living here in Washington long enough to get acquainted, unless he has been whizzing through the streets in his fast-moving automobile.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I have not been doing that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I walk and travel on the street cars and I observe how protective these platforms are.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ride the street cars every day, and I think the people of the city here pay for this service when they buy car tokens, and I believe the street-car people ought to furnish this as a part of the service they should furnish the people and not ask the taxpayers to carry the burden.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso, page 9, line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 9, beginning in line 23, strike out the proviso ending in line 3, page 10.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in the colloquial debate that has been going on in the last few minutes between the chairman of the subcommittee and myself the issue has arisen as to whether the construction and maintenance of the safety-zone passenger platforms paralleling the street-car tracks in different parts of the city are expenses that should be borne by the street-car company or by the District. I take the position very firmly that this is an expense that should be borne by the District and not by the street-car company.

I am opposed to the proviso for two reasons: One, you are not going to have any additional safety zones constructed because it is not to the interest of the street-car company to erect them but is primarily in the interest of the public or the users of the street cars; and, secondly, there is no way in which we can be more safely protected than by having such platforms.

I frequently have occasion to walk down the Avenue and I sometimes seek the protection of these marked zones, and yet there will be automobiles that come right along and try to whisk you off by invading the marked precincts. Why only yesterday, at the Peace Monument, I had to jump back onto the elevated sidewalk to keep from being hit.

Now, I am firmly of the opinion that these platforms should be erected, and the only way they can be erected is by the public. They will not be erected by the street-car companies. Are we going to protect the public or not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Are not these additional burdens sought to be put on the street-car companies because of the change of traffic brought about which cuts into their business and reduces the company's income?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not only that, but anyone casually acquainted with the history of the street-car companies, particularly the Capital Traction Co., knows that there has been a decided curtailment of transportation, because traffic conditions have changed—automobiles and low-priced taxis have taken their place.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of Members present, the gentleman from Wisconsin is objecting to the proviso carried in the bill in relation to loading platforms.

This provision has been carried in the bill ever since Mr. Funk was chairman of the subcommittee. In the hearings of the last year of his chairmanship it developed that money appropriated for placing traffic lights in the streets of Washington, some \$70,000, had been expended for placing granite curbs for loading platforms used by the street-car companies in the city of Washington and also for placing amber lights on two or three of the loading platforms that were built adjacent to Connecticut Avenue.

The committee at that time felt—and I assume, and while the matter has not been discussed for five years, the committee still feels—that the obligation for providing loading platforms for passengers of the street-car people belongs to the street-car companies, and not to the taxing public.

I think it is common knowledge in Washington that the street-car systems are not overly burdened with excessive operating costs. They have recently had an increase in rates. Naturally every public utility desires to transfer every cost it can to the public. But our opinion is that when the public pays for transportation it pays for the facilities necessary to that transportation, including the loading platforms. You might as well argue that the public ought to build railroad stations for the use of the public in going to and from the steam trains as to require the public to furnish the companies with loading platforms.

The proviso does not deny loading platforms for the safety of the people. The company can build the loading platforms and they can operate and maintain them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman cite any case where they have built one in the last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not state within the last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are all more than five years old.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not state to the gentleman that there are any new ones, but there are many now in use and maintained by the company.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THATCHER. Have the street-car companies made any formal remonstrance against this proviso?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Under what authority are the platforms built—is it by operation of law?

Mr. SIMMONS. I presume the Public Utilities Commission has the right to direct their erection. My recollection is that the only fatality we have had in Washington as a result of loading platforms is where people on one of these elevated platforms were swept down a year or so ago by an automobile that went completely over all of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman takes the position that they are of little value to the protection of life?

Mr. SIMMONS. Not at all, but I take the position that this is a limitation in the bill and is not causing any risk to anybody in life or limb, but is protecting the taxpayers of the city of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the case where some people were run down while standing on the platform.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. If there was any demand for additional safety zones, I think we would be justified in considering it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the grading of the Georgetown Reservoir (Wisconsin Avenue, between R Street and Brown Place NW.), for utilization as a site for a Georgetown branch library, and for drawing plans for a library building to be erected on such site, \$30,000; and such site is hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 11, line 14, after the figures "\$30,000," insert a comma and the following: "To be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services, \$105,020.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 12, line 4, after the figures "\$105,020," insert the following: *Provided*, That commencing with the date of the enactment of this act vacancies in the grade of junior clerks shall not be filled until the total number of such positions provided by appropriations has been reduced by three, and when so reduced the total number shall not be increased either during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931 or in the fiscal year 1932."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Telephones may be maintained in the residences of the superintendent of the water department, sanitary engineer, chief inspector of the street-cleaning division, assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division, inspector of plumbing, Director of Public Welfare, health officer, assistant health officer, chief of the bureau of preventable diseases, chief engineer of the fire department, superintendent of police, electrical inspector in charge of the fire-alarm system, one fire-alarm operator, and two fire-alarm repair men, the superintendent of machinery, and the fire marshal, under appropriations contained in this act. The commissioners may connect any or all of these telephones either to the system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., or the telephone system maintained by the District of Columbia, or to both of such systems. Telephones may also be maintained in the residences of the general superintendent of penal institutions and such other officials of the workhouse and reformatory as may be approved by the commissioners.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How extensive is the telephone system maintained by the District?

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman has reference to the language on page 16?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The commissioners may connect any or all of these telephones either to the system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. or the telephone system maintained by the District of Columbia, or to both of such systems.

I am seeking information as to whether we have a municipal telephone system here in competition with the private Bell Telephone Corporation?

Mr. SIMMONS. Frankly, I could not tell the gentlemen to what extent the telephone system is connected with these various activities, but it is all used in connection with the local private telephone system. It is not a municipal system except that there is the fire and police signal system.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, every city has that.

Mr. SIMMONS. And at the penal institutions at Occoquan and Lorton they have their branch systems.

Mr. STAFFORD. One further inquiry in regard to the paragraph immediately preceding. The bill forbids any pay-

ment of premiums on fire insurance. Do I understand from that that the District does not carry any insurance whatever on its buildings?

Mr. SIMMONS. So far as I know it does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it does not have any sinking fund for losses from fire?

Mr. SIMMONS. So far as I know it has not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction of the first unit of the municipal center, \$1,500,000, to be immediately available; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the preparation of site and completion of such unit at a total cost not exceeding \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the preparation of plans and specifications, cost of superintendence of construction, and employment of such architectural or other professional services as shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) or the classification act of 1923 as amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. This provides for an increase in the authorization for the creation of a municipal center. I believe the present authorization is \$5,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. My recollection is that the authorization calls for the purchase of land and the construction of buildings and that there is no limit in that authorizing act.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall, when the question was first brought up in this Congress I interpellated the gentleman on this, and my recollection is that it carried an appropriation of \$5,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have carried at two different times an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the purchase of land. I know of no reference in any place to \$5,000,000, unless it should have been a bill that I introduced and which was never acted upon to transfer the title of the Municipal Building to the United States, and of the accrediting to the District of the value of that.

Mr. STAFFORD. What estimate has been made that would be the basis of the total cost for the municipal center at \$6,000,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. The \$6,000,000 authorization calls for the building of what is known as the first wing to house the courts and the public-welfare activities.

There will be carried later on an authorization for a comparable wing to cost \$6,000,000. Then the leveling of the streets and the change of grades and the demolishing of buildings, and so forth, on the present site will call for probably another \$3,000,000, so that the total cost over the next five years for the municipal center will probably reach \$15,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What will be the total cost as far as land is concerned that it is purposed to be included in the municipal center, including the construction of the two proposed wings for which the gentleman estimates the cost will be about \$6,000,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. The land will cost a little under \$7,000,000. This wing will cost \$6,000,000. Another wing is to cost \$6,000,000 and the probability is that the demolishing of the buildings, grading the grounds, and such improvements including the change of the street levels, water pipes, sewer pipes, heating, and so forth, will cost \$3,000,000 in addition. So that altogether it will cost about \$22,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. By the end of next fiscal year how far will the work have advanced, as far as the purchase of the property is concerned?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is hoped that by the end of next fiscal year the larger part of the ground will be purchased. They have now 68 per cent of the ground purchased in the four blocks. We have appropriated \$6,000,000 out of the total cost that is understood will come less than \$7,000,000.

Part of that ground must be condemned. They are now condemning the ground that has not been bought, that is needed for this contemplated unit. Altogether, for ground and buildings, including changes, including the \$6,000,000

already appropriated, over the next five or six years it will be about \$22,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the National Government only contributes that part which is contributed in the forepart of the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. For the last two years the District bill has carried \$3,000,000 a year for the municipal center. This year it is \$1,500,000. At no time in the next five years should that amount exceed \$2,500,000 per year. As a set-off against that there will be the conversion cost credited to the District for the present Municipal Building which is estimated at something between \$4,000,000 and \$6,000,000, so that the cost of the municipal center hereafter each year should be less than it has been during the past two years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read down to the bottom of page 25.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 18, 27, and 79 to the bill (H. R. 15592) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes."

SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

Mr. HAWLEY, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 16111) to amend sections 1 and 7 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

SPEECHES OF REPRESENTATIVE GREEN, OF FLORIDA

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting some speeches made by my colleague [Mr. GREEN] at different times during the past few months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The speeches are as follows:

[Address of Congressman R. A. GREEN, delivered over radio, Washington, D. C., December 17, 1930.]

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION

At this particular time when a great financial panic is holding practically our entire Nation within its strong grip, it is a most fitting time to bring to the attention of the country the acute need for restricted immigration. According to good authorities there are to-day in America some 6,000,000 people unemployed; some authorities place the number of unemployment at as high as eight or nine million persons. If it is considered that these unemployed represent the bread earner for from three to four persons on the average, then we may safely conclude that there are to-day in our country some 30,000,000 persons who are directly and seriously affected by the lack of employment of the bread earner of the respective families. In many instances, in fact, I would say in most instances, this great army of unemployed and their families are now scantily existing upon the charity of public institutions and private individuals.

In many sections of our country to-day thousands of good American citizens are daily standing in line to receive a bowl of soup or piece of bread given by the charities of our Nation. These persons in the main have heretofore been wage earners of

our Nation, and have contributed to the welfare of its general institutions.

By a brief review of reliable statistics we find that practically all industries of our Nation have recently experienced a great reduction in their respective outputs. In the steel industry, for instance, we find during the past 12 months a decrease of about 59 per cent in its production, the most drastic slump which it has experienced in many years. The automobile industry, which has heretofore given employment to so many of our wage earners, has, during some months recently shown a decrease of as high as 68 per cent of its production as compared with its production the corresponding month of 1929. And, taken as a whole, the automobile production of our country during 1930 will show a decrease of almost 40 per cent. In 1929 over 5,000,000 automobiles were produced in our country, while this year it will run a little over 3,000,000. Building activity throughout our country will probably show an almost 40 per cent decline as against the figures of 1929. Manufacturing in general will probably show an almost equal decline in its 1930 total output, and also there is an alarming decrease in the market value of the output of our various factories. In some instances a decrease of possibly 50 or 60 per cent is shown. This, of course, has brought a great decrease in the total wage paid to the American wage earners during 1930. In fact, during 1929 there was paid to American wage earners more than \$44,000,000,000, not counting wages paid to farm hands and Federal employees, while in 1930 the amount will probably run about \$35,000,000,000. This great decrease in the aggregate amount of wages paid has brought suffering to our American people.

The imports and exports of our country have decreased during the past 12 months to an alarming degree. These economic conditions are mentioned merely to convince those who think primarily in finance that from an economic viewpoint the restriction of immigration is imperative. However, I am a firm believer in the restriction of immigration—not merely from a financial or economic point of view, but from a social and civic one as well. Those of my listeners who think first of the economic side of it, and who are not for restriction of immigration, surely can not obtain much consolation from the present economic condition of our country. When you are reminded that there are some 15,000,000 persons in America to-day of foreign birth, and that possibly half of these are not American citizens but are competing with our American wage earners in the various industries of our country, then you should join with the restrictionists and prevent further immigration to our country of aliens to compete with our American wage earners. When there are now millions of American wage earners unable to find employment, how can you conscientiously plead for the admission of additional immigrants? For several years I have been a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and have earnestly worked for restrictive measures, and I am now happy to see what appears to be a change of heart on the part of many House leaders. Heretofore it has been very hard to obtain favorable action upon restrictive measures, but now we find cooperation on the part of many of those heretofore opposed; in fact, we were on yesterday able to report from the House Immigration Committee a bill—No. 439—known as the Johnson bill, which will suspend practically all immigration for the next two years. This bill will, if enacted into law, go further in restriction than anything which we have been able to pass for several years. It, however, does not go as far as I believe it should.

ANTICOMMUNIST AMENDMENT

During our committee deliberations I offered an amendment to it "prohibiting entrance into our country of immigrants from any country which would not accept their deported subjects." I take the position that all countries are responsible for their own citizens, and that no immigrant should be permitted to enter into our country unless his country will again accept him if he is under the laws of our country deported. Citizens of a country are responsible for their own country's laws; therefore, why should America be compelled to accept aliens from a country which refuses to accept them when deported? Another amendment I offered to the bill, and which was also by the committee voted down, was that no immigrant would be admitted into our country unless he was of Caucasian blood and ancestry. I take the position that the United States is a white man's country and that we already have here too many colors, races, and mixtures, and why should our country continue to permit immigration of the blacks and other colored races? I do not believe that this immigration and amalgamation is for the best interest of either race, and I shall continue my efforts to the end that American immigration laws are so perfected that only white persons or American Indians may emigrate to the United States. I was also in hopes that the provisions of this bill would hold for five years or even indefinitely.

Now, if I may speak briefly relative to the real social, moral, and spiritual effect that immigration is having on our country, I would advise you that the question of immigration is one of the most vexing problems confronting our American people to-day. Literally hordes of foreign-born persons are flocking to our great Nation and threatening to devour every American institution. These American institutions have been the sole existence of our Nation. Without these institutions which we have so long cherished and preserved, our Nation would have been to-day in the same chaotic condition as exists in some foreign lands.

Few realize the seriousness of the situation existing at the present moment; in the hustle and bustle of American life few take the time to analyze the great dangers facing our National

Government and our national institutions due directly to this laxity and indifference, and it is high time that we acquaint ourselves with prevailing conditions and take immediate steps to put a stop to this foreign invasion.

There have been leaders in Congress who have made a thorough study of the immigration problem—this study has extended over a period of years—they have gone to the very root of the evil, and to a man, they have persistently advocated legislative measures to put up the bars and to protect our Nation, our institutions, and our citizens from this army of alien undesirables who, because of the fact that they are willing to work for practically nothing, compete with the American laborer, and because of the lure of easy money, become racketeers and gunmen and openly call for the destruction by revolution or otherwise of our form of government and the substitution of one similar to that of Soviet Russia.

Thousands seek admission to the United States annually who are practically penniless. A recent report of the Commissioner of Immigration shows that 36 per cent of these immigrants have less than \$50 when they reach America. How long will that amount last? How long is it after their arrival before they will have to seek the aid of our charitable institutions? With employment at a premium, how long will it take them to meet fellow countrymen engaged in lawless rackets who will paint pictures of untold wealth in the field of crime? Is the intelligence of this class of newcomers of a quality that will resist temptation?

The press of the Nation daily carries stories of racketeers and racketeering—some cities of our country are overrun with an element that breathes open defiance to the laws of our Nation. Conditions have been so alarming as to cause the honest citizenry to form crime committees to combat this menace that has torn at the very roots of organized authority. These cities are to-day attempting to rid themselves of a number of dangerous gunmen classed as public enemies. Has it ever occurred to you that practically every name appearing on these lists is either foreign born or of alien parentage? It would appear that these cities have been wrested from the decent citizens and are controlled by foreigners who have been proclaimed vice kings. It would appear that the duly constituted authorities are helpless in the face of this invasion. These cities are empires within a Republic. Killers have stalked the streets of the metropolises with guns in their bloody hands belching forth sheets of flame, leaving dead and dying strewn about.

What is the answer to this open challenge to law and order? Stop immigration permanently; deport those responsible for such outrageous conditions. Quell this revolution that is threatening to sweep over the Nation, leaving in its wake death and destruction.

COMMUNISTS

Three weeks ago when the final session of the Seventy-first Congress convened, motley radicals gathered on the east front and attempted to storm the Capitol building. Police reserves, hastily summoned, succeeded in dispersing this crowd only after clubs, fists, and tear gas had been freely used. Eye witnesses estimate the number of communists at 300, and strange as it may seem not one among them appeared to be a real American. I witnessed this deplorable spectacle.

Only recently a congressional committee which is conducting hearings into the activities in America of communists obtained the startling testimony from a witness that the communists did not believe in church or church marriage, and that communists going through the church marriage ceremony will be of no benefit to their party and would be promptly thrown out of the party. These breeders of contempt for America and her cherished institutions should be promptly deported from American soil. They are enemies of the family, enemies of the home, enemies of continued authority, and enemies of the American flag, and should not enjoy the liberty and protection of our great Government. These are the ones that I hoped to reach by deportation through my proposed amendment to the Johnson bill.

The citizens of our great and glorious Nation are not lawless—they are thoroughly satisfied with the form of Government under which they are prospering. It is that element of aliens which should not have been admitted to entry that is responsible for our present wave of crime. Our prisons are full of them. Our cemeteries contain the remains of others, carried to their final resting place with pomp and ceremony by their comrades of the gangland empire. Do not understand me to say that all persons of foreign birth are bad. In my own district there are persons of Greek, or English, or other foreign birth, but they are not this communist type, they are decent citizens.

It is this situation that is confronting a busy Congress to-day, and the Members of the legislative body are going to meet it with legislation that will stop the influx of the alien horde and thus cut off the source of recruiting for gangland's army. It is not a simple problem with which we have to deal—it requires much study and investigation, but I feel confident that helpful legislation will be enacted before adjournment.

Entrance visas should not be issued by the American immigration authorities to any person who, by his appearance and background is not such as to warrant the officials that he could and would readily make of himself a desirable American citizen from every point of view. A brief view of the foreign hordes besieging our ports of entry will cause the casual observer to readily realize the impossibility of the vast majority of these immigrants, ever being able to take on American ideals and institutions. To such of those who appear to be the scum of the earth, no entrance visas should be issued.

[Address of Congressman R. A. GREEN, of Starke, Fla., delivered at the Twenty-third Annual Convention of the Atlantic Deepwater Waterways Association, at Wilmington, N. C., October 7, 1930]

FLORIDA CANAL AND OTHER WATERWAY IMPROVEMENTS

To-day, the most important inland-waterway project of the United States is the proposed canal across north Florida, connecting the Atlantic intracoastal waterway with the intracoastal waterway of the Gulf of Mexico. This great intracoastal canal system begins at Boston, traverses the Atlantic coast line, crosses the upper part of the peninsula of Florida, and thence on along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico through New Orleans, and to the Rio Grande River.

The canal across north Florida is the missing and final link of the entire chain, and it is obvious that the time is not distant when this final link will be constructed. The Sixty-ninth Congress authorized the purchase of the portion of the Intracoastal Canal Waterway known as Cape Cod Canal at the price of several millions of dollars. The next project of the system is from Delaware River to Chesapeake, Delaware, and Maryland. This waterway, usually known as the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, is a sea-level canal extending from Reedy Point, on the Delaware River, about 41 miles below Philadelphia, Pa., to the junction of Back Creek and Elk River, about 4 miles west of Chesapeake City, Md., a distance of about 19 miles, with a branch channel extending from Delaware City, Del., for a distance of 1.8 miles to the junction with the channel from Reedy Point, Del. The drainage area is about 65 miles. This canal formerly was private property, operated as a toll canal, beginning July 4, 1829. The total original cost was \$2,250,000, of which \$450,000 was paid by the United States, \$100,000 by Pennsylvania, \$50,000 by Maryland, and \$25,000 by Delaware, and the remainder by citizens of three States. It was purchased by the Government for \$2,514,289.70. It is about 12 feet deep and 90 feet wide.

In connection with this we might, in passing, mention the inland waterway from Chincoteague Bay, Va., to Delaware Bay at or near Lewes, Del.; also waterway on the coast of Virginia. Next we have an inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort, N. C. The existing project provides for an inland waterway with a depth of 12 feet at mean low water between Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort Inlet, N. C., a distance of 206.28 miles, with bottom width varying from 90 feet in land cuts to 300 feet in open water. The estimated cost for new work, revised in 1925, is \$8,000,937, exclusive of amounts expended under previous projects. The latest (1916) approved estimate for annual cost of maintenance is \$85,000. This project is practically completed.

The next link in the chain is inland waterway from Beaufort, N. C., to the Cape Fear River, including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C. The existing project provides for a waterway 12 feet deep at mean low water, with a bottom width of 90 feet, extending along the coast from Beaufort, N. C., to the Cape Fear River, a distance of 93 miles. The estimated cost of new work, made in 1926, is \$5,800,000, with \$150,000 annually for maintenance. This part of the project is about 25 per cent completed.

The next link is from Cape Fear River, N. C., to the St. Johns River, Fla. This last-mentioned link is practically all authorized except a small portion in the vicinity of Conway, S. C., which is for the time being held in abeyance on account, it appears, of local differences as to the exact location of the channel. This link, however, will soon be completed to Fernandina and Jacksonville, Fla., giving, in the main, 8-foot depth, with suitable width.

For the time being we will pass over the peninsula of Florida to Pensacola, where, at the last session of Congress, we were able to obtain authorization for \$600,000 for the construction of the canal from Pensacola to Mobile. Thence the intracoastal waterway goes on to New Orleans and from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, Tex., a distance of some 700 miles. It is estimated that this last link will cost some \$16,000,000; however, it is rapidly nearing completion, with a depth of 9 feet. On this particular link local interests were to obtain right of way, guarantee a certain amount of annual tonnage, and certain other performances. It is my understanding that practically all of these local performances have been met or will be met in the very near future. Then we may soon expect the final construction of this link. From Corpus Christi on to the Rio Grande, a distance of ninety to a little over a hundred miles, is now under survey and it is hoped that favorable reports may be had as a result of this survey and thus add the western end of the system to the other approved portions.

The thing, of course, which now concerns us the greatest is the actual construction of this final link across the northern part of Florida. The situation may well be compared to a hard road constructed at great public expense to either side of a large stream and no bridge built across the stream. Of course, it is obvious that this road could not render even 50 per cent of its usefulness unless the stream were spanned. That is precisely the same as with the huge sums that have been expended by the Government and local interests already in the construction and maintenance of this great intracoastal canal system. It is all necessary and important that the link across Florida be promptly constructed, giving the final connection and full realization of the usefulness of the entire system.

The rivers and harbors act of 1927 incorporated a survey, which it was my fortune to introduce, for this link. With the cooperation of the Florida State Canal Commission, the United States Board of Army Engineers and chambers of commerce of cities in Florida, we were able to incorporate in the 1930 rivers and harbors act, a bill which I again had the pleasure of introducing, for further surveys of the link. In the latter provisions the Board

of Army Engineers is authorized and directed to survey all feasible routes for this link and to make its report thereon. Somehow I am confident that the final report of the board will be so favorable as to warrant prompt authorization and expenditure by the Federal Government of sufficient funds to construct this missing link.

While construction of this link, it has been estimated, would cost from \$50,000,000 to \$150,000,000, even such an amount would be only a small percentage of the cost which has already been expended and which will in the future be expended for the remainder of this system. I can not believe that our Government, in its economic and financial prudence, can long be willing to permit the existing curtailment of benefits of the money already expended by not completing the link. The completion of this link, and by same the sending of boats directly across the upper part of the peninsula of Florida, will save from 500 to 900 miles in distance from the east Atlantic waters to New Orleans and other Mississippi Valley ports. In this age of highly developed industry and general commerce and transportation, time is often the essence of all transactions; therefore, the time which would be saved to commerce in passing through the canal as over the time in going around the Florida Peninsula, would, within a few years, fully justify all cost of construction.

With the construction of this link, the perils so often encountered from storms and weather conditions would be avoided. The saving in loss by storm would, in due course of time, almost pay for construction.

To-day there is a general awakening in the development of our American inland waterways. Why, we now have a Mississippi Valley system of well over 13,000 miles, these waterways giving rapid and cheap transportation to those great States of the Mississippi Valley. Upon this one system the Federal Government has already expended probably well over five hundred millions of dollars, and there is no indication that the Government will cease its waterway activities in the Mississippi Valley, but on the other hand every indication is that even greater achievement along this line may be expected in the future.

Time will not permit discussion of the great development of the Great Lakes system—the Erie Canal system and the various other waterway systems to which our Government is rightfully committed and on which it is expending millions of dollars annually. The truth of this statement is borne out when we are reminded of the total allotment for maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbor work in our country for the past few years. In 1925, our Government expended \$40,275,000; in 1926, \$50,200,000; in 1927, \$50,150,000; in 1928, \$56,541,310; in 1929, \$50,000,000; and in 1930, \$67,000,000. It will be seen by these figures that in the main this expenditure is increasing. I believe that 1930 will expend a sum well over the \$67,000,000 mark.

The Federal Government rarely appropriates and expends Federal funds unless the expenditures are fairly well justified. Some persons possibly would wonder how expenditures of these huge sums could well be justified, but when we are reminded that the annual water-borne tonnage is so rapidly increasing, then it is easy to see that these expenditures are not only justified but fully warranted. The total water-borne commerce of our country in 1920, through the ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, ports on the Great Lakes, our rivers, canals, and connecting channels, amounted to 399,000,000 tons, valued at \$20,531,000,000. This volume increased annually, until in 1926 it amounted to 540,500,000 tons, valued at \$26,722,000,000. There was a slight decrease in the tonnage and its value for 1928. The tonnage was decreased by about 1,000,000 tons and the value thereof by about \$2,000,000,000. But it is highly probable that the 1931 and 1932 commerce will again show a healthy increase.

There are other significant reasons why the Government is rapidly developing its inland waterways. Chief among these reasons, I would say, is the reduced cost of transportation. Commerce can be carried, and is carried, on water for from 10 to 50 per cent of the cost by other methods. I believe transportation on the Great Lakes is estimated to cost possibly only 10 per cent of the cost by other methods. We find particularly that heavy and bulky items of commerce, as iron ore, coal, lumber, timber, the various building materials, and even grain, are rapidly going to water for transportation.

We also find that the development of waterways builds up industries in our agricultural as well as industrial sections. The cheaper transportation of the bulky items of commerce, of course, increases a demand for these various items because the low cost of transportation is reflected in the sale price of these various items and thus consumption and utilization of products are stimulated.

We also find now that other common carriers, as railways, are coordinating with water transportation.

It is remarkable to note the development of inland waterways in the old countries of the world, as Germany, France, Austria, and other old European countries. The first reason, I believe, for this great development in the Old World was economy, and if through their centuries of civilization and national development they have found saving and economy by full development of their inland waterways, of course, we may rightfully expect our Nation to eventually lead in similar economy by saving to our people all possible through the means of this waterway development.

Well do we remember the efforts for construction of the Panama Canal by the French and English peoples, and later the criticisms of American leaders when they advanced this great project. It appeared then that the sum of \$400,000,000 required for its construction was a fabulous sum altogether unjustified for the expenditure, but the time and money which have already been saved

to the people of the world by its utilization has convinced even the most pessimistic that it was one of the best investments that our Nation ever made. In fact, it would be almost inconceivable to-day to imagine our country and the other countries carrying on their commerce, transportation, and trade without a canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

For the first year or two the tonnage passing through the canal was not unusually large, but the tonnage has rapidly increased, and for the fiscal year 1930 the commercial traffic through the Panama Canal, made up of vessels of 24 nations, aggregated a total tonnage of 29,630,709 tons, with a toll collection of \$26,944,499.77. Of course, the operating and maintenance cost of the Panama Canal is negligible when we count it against the almost \$27,000,000 worth of tolls collected annually.

The States of the Mississippi Valley, as well as the States of the Southeast and the East Atlantic States, are all anxious to see the Florida canal constructed. The demand for this canal is so evident and the necessity so great that our Government soon will construct it. Our Nation is a great Nation and does things in a big way. Yes; some \$700,000,000 have been recently authorized for flood control of the Mississippi. The Strawberry Dam, the Roosevelt Dam, and numerous other great reclamation projects have received millions of dollars from our Federal Treasury. Only recently approximately \$165,000,000 have been authorized for the Boulder Canyon Dam project.

The Congress has recently authorized \$43,042,070.58 for Federal buildings throughout the United States. (This does not include the item for maintenance, which is \$12,701,555.79, making a grand total of \$55,743,626.35.) Our Nation does things in a big way; and it is inconceivable to believe that it will permit much time to elapse before the canal is constructed across north Florida connecting our intracoastal waterway of the Atlantic coast with that of the Gulf of Mexico. It is bound to come, but we must expend our efforts to accomplish it in the shortest possible time.

Florida has faith in the Federal Government; this faith is justified by past performances by the Government for the State of Florida. This generosity of the Federal Government causes all Floridians to believe Uncle Sam will construct that canal across Florida. May I enumerate some Federal benefits that have been accorded Florida recently for rivers and harbors development?

In 1925 Florida was allotted \$1,395,339; in 1926, \$2,145,244; in 1927, \$2,446,729; in 1928, \$1,226,513; in 1929, \$1,143,294; in 1930, \$2,228,200. From these figures it is easy to see that our annual allotment has increased, but at the end of the fiscal year 1930-31 you will see a perceptible increase in Florida's allotment.

The Florida delegation was, at the last session of Congress, able to obtain benefits beyond the hopes of even our most optimistic. Among these authorizations secured are: \$63,000 for the St. Johns River from Palatka to Lake Harney; \$111,000 for the St. Johns River from Jacksonville to the ocean; \$885,000 for Miami Harbor; \$800,000 for the Miami River; \$239,200 for Tampa Harbor; \$22,500 for Charlotte Harbor; St. Petersburg Harbor, \$45,000; St. Marks River, \$11,000; waterway from Pensacola to Mobile, \$600,000; Choctawhatchee Bay, \$600,000; Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, \$7,692,000. In addition to these authorizations, considerable money is now being expended upon improvements in Cedar Key Harbor from funds already available. Including the \$4,221,000 authorized a few months ago for the Florida East Coast Canal, this gives a grand total authorization for Florida, under the new bill, of more than fourteen and a half million dollars.

We were also able to obtain a very large number of surveys looking forward to the eventual authorization of Federal funds for further improvements. Notable among these is the survey of the canal across Florida. Probably the outstanding achievement for Florida during the past four years was the final realization of our efforts of many years for Federal aid in the Florida Everglades. Florida has attended congressional hearings and worked on this great project for several years, so finally at the last session of Congress we were able to obtain Federal responsibility and aid in this matter. The recent rivers and harbors act authorizes some seven million dollars to be expended by the Government, same to be matched with some two million dollars of State money, for flood control, reclamation, and navigation in the Lake Okeechobee, Everglades, and Caloosahatchee River area. Local interests, of course, will be required to perform other cooperative efforts, but somehow I look on this achievement of a united Florida as a master stroke not only in the interest of Florida's economic and industrial life but in the interest of the life of Florida citizens. It will redound great benefits, eventually, to the entire country.

[Speech of Congressman R. A. GREEN, of Starke, Fla., delivered over radio station WRUF, Gainesville, Fla., on Navy Day, October 27, 1930, at 5 p. m.]

UNITED STATES NAVY

Almost a century and a half ago, when the Constitution of the United States was put into full force and effect, it carried a provision "To provide for the common defense," and also another provision, "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

In compliance with these provisions of the Constitution, the United States has ever since maintained a Navy which, we believe, has been adequate for the common defense of all citizens of the United States as well as their posterity. We believe also that the Navy of the United States has always been sufficiently adequate to secure the "blessings of liberty to the peoples of the United States and to their posterity." As a matter of fact, even during the Revolutionary War we were not without this great protecting

arm of defense. Well do we recall how history records how John Paul Jones, with his *Bonhomme Richard*, sailed up the east coast of Great Britain, near the mouth of the Humber, encountering the British man of war *Serapis*. There, with the muzzles of his own ship's guns touching the muzzles of the guns of the *Serapis*, courageously and heroically defeated the crew of the *Serapis*. Thus, in the very beginning, impetus to the cause of the American water defense, the security won by John Paul Jones at sea, General Washington and others on land, which led to our final independence, was to remain for only a little more than a quarter of a century, when we again find the United States and the British Empire at war.

In this War of 1812 the most significant rôle was played by the American Navy. In fact, the American land defense and aggression was almost at a standstill until America's brilliant naval action on Lake Erie. In this memorial encounter Lieut. Oliver H. Perry, on September 10, 1813, met the pride of Britain's Navy, won a decisive victory, and reported as follows: "We have met the enemy and they are ours." The Americans were victorious in this war in a series of brilliant naval duels. The American *Constitution* met and conquered the *Guerriere* in 30 minutes, and Great Britain was alarmed at the speed of the American ships and at the accuracy of the marksmanship of the American sailors, so it launched an extensive naval-building program, and through her excess in numbers only was she able to meet and compete with our Navy. At that time one of the largest English newspapers was quoted as follows: "If they fight they are sure to conquer; if they flee they are sure to escape." Such was America's Navy during the War of 1812.

A little more than a century after our great Nation had been in existence our Navy was forced to meet an arrogant and powerful adversary. War was declared with Spain on account of Spanish oppression of Cuban subjects, and for other reasons. Time will not permit mentioning all of the brilliant achievements of our Navy during this struggle, but it will suffice to say that Commodore Dewey met and destroyed a large Spanish Fleet at Manila. Likewise, Admiral William Sampson and Admiral W. S. Schley met and took the powerful Spanish Fleet of Admiral Cervera in the vicinity of Santiago. One of the outstanding feats of this brilliant warfare during the Spanish-American War was the daring courage of Commander Richard P. Hobson when he took the *Merrimac*—sinking it in the mouth of the Santiago Harbor—and thus bottling up the most dangerous fleet in the Spanish Navy. This daring feat of Commander Hobson is mentioned only to reassure us that America has always had sailors individually, as well as collectively, who are ready and willing to offer themselves in defense of our great Nation.

More recently, during the World War, the superior organization and gigantic strength of the American Navy have written the brightest chapter in the seafaring history of the world. Somehow I believe that the Hon. Josephus Daniels, of Raleigh, N. C., was really the man of the hour who put new determination in our Navy during its most perilous hour. History must ever record the finer qualities and higher ability of this distinguished American who so well directed our Nation's Navy that some 2,000,000 soldiers were transported to a foreign land without a hitch, and with a minimum toll of life and property. It may also be mentioned how the allied navy, consisting largely of the British and American Fleets, overcame the German submarine warfare and made the channels of ocean traffic safe for navigation. On the morning of November 21, 1918, the Grand Fleet, anchored off the coast of Scotland, steamed into the North Sea and was drawn into two lines 3 miles apart, forming a majestic avenue to receive the surrendering German fleet, but the American Fleet was to take no chance on what was to be a German surrender, but instead had every gun crew at its position with the mighty guns of every ship loaded and ready for action. Admiral Rodman said of this situation, "There is not the slightest possibility of trouble, but we are overlooking no chances." Thus it will be seen that even in the hour after triumph had been proclaimed and victory won and the achievement of the war recorded, our American commander, the sailor that he was, took no chances, but had his sailors ready for action in case the unexpected should happen. Such has been the tradition of the American Navy—ever prepared, ready and willing to defend the life and property of our great Nation. So to-day, my friends, I am glad to commend the stability and achievements of this great arm of our national defense and to join with other millions of American citizens in this Navy Day observance. I am happy to join with Commander Lawson E. Hill, commanding officer of naval communication reserve in Gainesville, Fla., in this observance.

Thus it is evident that in the construction of these gigantic carriers our Navy indeed had in mind the inspiring lines of Longfellow's poem, *Building of the Ship*, when the merchant spoke to building master, as follows:

"Build me straight, O worthy master!
Stanch and strong, a goodly vessel,
That shall laugh at all disaster,
And with wave and whirlwind wrestle!"

The State of Florida should be foremost in this great observance for many reasons. When war was declared in 1917 we had only one naval air station, and it was located at Pensacola, Fla. At this station the leadership in naval air training, of course, was obtained. By the close of the war 21 air stations had been established with nearly 3,000 officers and 30,000 enlisted men, 26 airships and more than 1,200 planes in operation. In our allied countries we had, during the war, seaplane stations, from which

we carried on submarine and scouting patrol, and in this connection it is interesting to note that a detachment of 200 naval aviators and mechanics were the first armed forces from the United States to land in France. Steps have been taken to enlarge the training facilities at Pensacola. Catapults have been designed and used for battleships and airships. The Navy now has three large aircraft carriers in operation—the *Langley*, *Lexington*, and *Saratoga*. Aircrafts are carried on 34 other combatant ships of the Navy. Over 900 model airplane designs for every purpose are in commission, and lighter-than-air developments are progressing satisfactorily. The performance of our Navy planes has been remarkable. Of the 69 recognized world records 24 are held by the United States, and 11 of these 24 were established by the Navy with service planes. It is a bit hard for us to realize that our airplane carriers have, respectively, floor space of $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres; that is, 888 feet long by 90 feet wide. One hundred and twenty planes from each of these carriers can be almost instantly put into operation. One of the most inspiring events of my life was recently the observation of the great air maneuvers by American Army and Navy planes. The various flight formations, the skill with which the planes were launched, handled, and landed. The unusually efficient training of the men who handled the planes. Not only is it an inspiration to all American citizens but gives to one that satisfaction of protection and security as such a condition so well indicates. These planes are the eyes of the Navy, and well has this branch of our Navy been developed.

In fact, it occurs to me that the present Secretary of the Navy, the Hon. Charles Francis Adams, is neglecting nothing in the perfecting of our Navy in accordance with our various treaty and armament conferences. Through the Navy, its officers and men, Mr. Secretary Adams is not only prepared to defend our Nation at a moment's notice but he is carrying many other services to the American people.

A large quantity of steel and iron from our country is used in the construction of our Navy vessels and planes. Thus employment to thousands and thousands of our American citizens is obtained. Through the manufacture within the United States of our various naval craft vessels, our own factories have been prepared and developed to such an extent that in case of war we would be almost entirely independent in the construction of our many weapons of warfare.

Mr. Secretary Adams has also, through his department, made marvelous achievements in the direction and perfection of radio and its various uses. These benefits are in return reflected upon the industries of our country and go to the general information, benefits, and use of all our American citizens. Great research and investigation is carried on by the Navy Department of our country, and such information and benefits as are thus obtained are in the due course of time given to the general citizenship of our country.

Great training stations are established for the enlisted men of the Navy, and in turn the youth of our land are thus offered schooling in the various trades and in common industry. In this manner electricians, mechanics, navigators, cobblers, and cooks are trained and developed. In fact, American battleships respectively represent a complete city, where many of the advantages, conveniences, and trainings of a full life may be had. The Navy employs scientists, physicists, engineers, metallurgists, accountants, whose experiments and findings are eventually passed on to industry and all our American citizens.

Great is the result being accomplished by the United States Navy and its personnel. This great service, of course, is not accomplished without monetary cost. It is costing the United States Government, to keep this peace-time Navy, approximately \$400,000,000 annually. This is a large expenditure, but America's trade and commerce is ever expanding and increasing more than the other great nations. In 1900 the foreign trade of the United States was about two and one-quarter billions. With Great Britain the same year it was four and one-quarter billions, but the foreign trade of the United States in 1928 was about nine and one-quarter billions, and with Great Britain about nine and three-quarter billion dollars. It will be seen by this comparison that in 1900 the foreign trade of the United States was only about one-half that of Great Britain, while in 1928 it was about the same. I am comparing Great Britain with the United States, because I believe Great Britain has more foreign trade than any other foreign country. Our American merchant marine is carrying on much of our foreign trade. In fact, about a billion-dollar business was done by the American merchant marine.

America still has her colonial possessions which are far flung. Our avenues of trade extend throughout the world. Our own lands and territories extend from the Philippine Islands in the far Pacific to Alaska in the frigid Arctic and to Porto Rico in the tropical Atlantic. Therefore in order to keep abreast as a great world power, and in order to protect the citizens, the trade, and general economic life of our Nation it is of necessity that an adequate Navy be maintained at all times.

The State of Florida is peculiar in its physical existence. Did you ever stop to realize that Florida has more than 1,300 miles of seacoast and that it is impossible to go farther than 60 or 70 miles from the seacoast? Did you ever stop to realize that it would be possible for a monstrous battleship of an enemy nation to anchor on the coast of Florida and shell every inch of land within our great State? With our long coast line and the narrowness of our peninsula and the great power of guns to be carried in the future by battleships this is altogether possible; therefore it is obvious that all Floridians are enthusiastic for an adequate

Navy. It is also interesting to note that the State of Florida has for many years held an assignment on the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. This assignment is held by Congressman H. J. DRANE, Lakeland, Fla., who is an authority on naval affairs, and we Floridians may well rely upon our representation in national naval affairs, so long as he sits on this powerful committee.

America to-day is not an imperialistic nation. Her citizenship is not considered militarists, but in view of the present troubled conditions, revolutions sporadic throughout much of the civilized world, with some sections of Europe seething with rivalry, if not, indeed, zeal for conquest, with communists and sovietism threatening the liberties of the citizens of independent countries, and other conditions which we shall not enumerate, it is obvious that America must maintain a Navy and an Army altogether adequate for our national defense, and thus let there ever remain—

“The union of lakes, the union of lands,
The union of States none can sever,
The union of hearts, the union of hands,
And the flag of our Union forever.”

[Speech of Congressman R. A. GREEN, of Starke, Fla., delivered over radio station WJAX, October 23, at 7:30 p. m., Jacksonville, Fla.]

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Recently it was my pleasure to address you relative to national legislation for the Spanish-American War veterans, and now it is again my pleasure to address you, but this time on the subject of World War veterans' legislation.

Significant along this line is the fact that the Congress at the last session passed what is in reality a pension bill for disabled World War veterans. Up until the last session of Congress legislation had from time to time been enacted which allowed compensation and other benefits to veterans who were suffering with a service-connected disability. By service connection, of course, is meant a disability which was either incurred in or aggravated by the veteran's service. Prior to the last session of Congress compensation was paid to World War veterans who had disability to a degree of 10 per cent or greater, at the rates, I believe, of from \$10 per month for 10 per cent permanent disability to \$100 per month for permanent total disability.

There was also passed some two years ago what was known as the emergency officers' retirement act, which allowed to certain disabled officers compensation at a rate comparable with their rank when discharged from the military or naval service.

It was apparent at the convening of the last session of Congress that there were thousands of worthy World War veterans in the United States who were suffering with disabilities, many of them with even 100 per cent disability, but who had been unable to connect their disability with their service. In fact, it is very difficult to trace back for 10 years or longer a disability which a World War veteran may now have and show that it was incident to or incurred while he was in the service. Of course, many veterans still are daily proving service connection, while, on the other hand, thousands and thousands with disabilities have been unable to prove service connection. Then, there were thousands of veterans with disabilities which had no color of service connection—disabilities which had been incurred in civil life, in industry, in motor-vehicle wrecks, and through the various means in which humanity is always meeting its fate. For this large class of veterans the recent act of Congress sought relief.

We had before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation a large number of bills. Finally two of these bills gained greater favor—one the Rankin bill, so named for the Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, the ranking minority member of the committee, and the other the Johnson bill, named for the Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, chairman of the committee. It was apparent to me that the veterans' organizations throughout the country favored the Rankin bill, because it was more liberal and comprehensive. Finally, the Johnson bill was reported to the House, with the result that the substance of the Rankin bill was substituted by the membership of the House. After passage this bill went to the Senate, was promptly passed by the Senate, but met veto at the White House. But the veto of the Rankin bill did not mean death of World War legislation. We were determined to have relief for nonservice-connected veterans.

Promptly after the President's veto the House and Senate passed the disability allowance act of July 3, 1930. Under the provisions of this act World War veterans, regardless of service connection or disability, may receive benefits in the way of pensions or disability allowance at the rate of \$12 monthly for 25 per cent disability, \$18 per month for 50 per cent disability, \$24 per month for 75 per cent disability, and \$40 per month for total disability. Veterans who pay an income tax may not receive the benefits of this act. Neither is disability compensable if it is a result of the veteran's own vicious habits.

Payment of disability allowance, if allowed the veteran, will begin from the date the veteran files his application with the Veterans' Bureau. Thousands of veterans throughout the country are applying for benefits under the provisions of this act, and I earnestly urge that all veterans who have 25 per cent disability or more promptly write to the United States Veterans' Bureau or to their Members of Congress for application blanks. Carefully fill out and execute the blank and return it to the Veterans' Bureau. Within a short while after the application is filed with the bureau you will be called for examination, and will be awarded disability allowance in accordance with the provisions of the law.

It was our desire to begin payment of pension if the veteran had as low as 10 per cent disability, and it was also our desire to begin the minimum payment of \$20 per month and the maximum payment of \$60 or \$72 per month, but these provisions we were unable to include in the bill. It is believed, however, that from time to time this act will be liberalized by future amendments.

Another provision of the act of July 3, 1930, directs the Veterans' Bureau to consider affidavits made by laymen, as well as physicians, relative to the physical condition of World War veterans. It was found almost impossible in many cases for veterans to obtain certificates from physicians who treated them within one year of their discharge from the service, as their discharge has now been 10 or 11 years; therefore, it was very important to obtain a provision authorizing and directing the Veterans' Bureau to give consideration to the affidavits of laymen who knew the physical condition of the veteran subsequent to his discharge. This provision will render great benefits in proving service connection.

And, by the way, the new act does not conflict with the provisions of the old act in proving service connection of disabilities, even if disability allowance or pension has been granted the veteran. At any time the veteran may, if possible, prove service connection of any of his disabilities and then elect to receive the benefits of the old law if he so chooses. He can not receive the pension benefits of the new law and the compensation benefits of the old law at the same time but may elect the one giving him the greater benefit, if and when he is able to prove service connection.

While the act of July 3 is not as liberal as we had desired, yet it carries a disability pension to World War veterans within from 10 to 12 years from date of their discharge, while Spanish-American War veterans had to wait more than 20 years for their pension; and I believe the veterans of the Civil War had to wait longer than the Spanish-American War veterans. However, the unusual conditions to which the World War veterans were subjected and the long duration of their period of actual combat, rendered their physical and mental state much more acute in many instances; therefore it was believed that though the years since their discharge have been few, their pensions were fully justified.

Another amendment which we confidently hope will be accomplished in the near future will be a provision for compensation or pension benefits to the widows and minor children of deceased World War veterans, regardless of the cause of the veteran's death. Under existing law, if a World War veteran dies of service-connected compensable disabilities, his widow and minor children share benefits; but if he dies from a disease or ailment not of service origin, of course, there is no provision for his widow and orphan children. During the last session of Congress I introduced a bill which would provide that in the case of the death, from any cause, of any person receiving compensation under section 202, compensation shall be payable, without regard to the provisions of section 206, to the dependents of such person in the same manner and to the same extent and subject to the same conditions and limitations as if the death of such person resulted from injury incurred in the military or naval service after April 6, 1917, and before July 2, 1921. We had hoped that it would be possible to obtain the inclusion of this item in the act of July 3, but owing to the fact that it would have carried an additional expenditure of some \$12,000,000 annually, we were unable to obtain its inclusion. However, several members of the World War Veterans' Committee have agreed to the enactment of this provision in the near future. Recently I had a most heart-rending experience when a young widow of a deceased World War veteran in my district appealed for benefits for herself and four small children, only to find that compensation could not be paid her because her husband died of causes not of service origin. This case prompted me to introduce the bill above mentioned, and I confidently believe it will be passed in the next year or two.

It will probably be information to many of my hearers to know that under existing law reimbursement of burial expenses up to the amount of \$107 may be had by those bearing the burial expenses of World War veterans. The person who bears these expenses is entitled to the reimbursement.

It is also noteworthy that the Government now furnishes grave markers for unmarked graves of the veterans of all wars, including Confederate veterans. Up until recently this grave marker was furnished for the unmarked graves of all war veterans except those of the Confederate Army, but at the last session of Congress we were able to obtain an appropriation, in compliance with a bill I introduced, for the manufacture of these markers for Confederate as well as other veterans. These stones are shipped, prepaid, by the Government to some responsible relative or other persons who will erect them at the graves. If you know of an unmarked grave of any soldier, you should apply either to the War Department or to your Member of Congress for an application blank, if you wish to receive and erect one of these stones.

My own belief is that no Government benefits are too great for the American soldiers who joined with the allied countries of Europe against the imperialistic central powers in that great struggle which determined whether the world would be occupied by small, free, self-governing nations, or be a single, dominant, autocratic, imperialistic power. The existence of all free government throughout the land was in grave danger. The great conflict in which these men played their noble part began with the struggle between the land-rich nations and the land-poor nations of Europe. Russia, England, and France had vast colonial posses-

sions. Germany and Austria were in quest of land for colonization. These two nations, Germany in particular, looked longingly at the rich lands of South America and upon those of the Euphrates Valley.

The Monroe doctrine which had for so many years been proclaimed by the American people caused the eye of the Kaiser to turn from South America to the nearer lands of the Euphrates Valley. Germany and Austria, it was apparent, desired to make Turkey their dependency, then advance on with their iron hand and take over the Euphrates section. Of course, France, England, and Russia readily saw the plan of Germany, and, as a matter of ultimate self-preservation, grouped themselves together to prevent the realization of this plan of Germany and Austria.

The archduke was assassinated, and Austria demanded that Serbia become her vassal. Of course, this was the beginning of the actual conflict between Russia, England, and France on the one side and Austria and Germany on the other. Well does history record the patience, wisdom, diplomacy, and gigantic efforts of our great President, Woodrow Wilson, in his efforts that our country remain neutral and let Europe settle her own affairs. But in the mad rush of conquest Germany and Austria disregarded all international law and all human regard for life and property. In the battle of self-preservation, of course, the allied countries courted the counsel and support of our American Nation. America maintained its rights to navigate the seas and carry on its trade with all nations, but in Germany's march for greed and supremacy the rights of nations were disregarded. American ships were sunk; neutral and free States became forbidden avenues of trade. German submarines claimed the right to dominate practically all waters. America was even told the number of ships she could and could not send to European countries. In fact, the German rulers became drunk with their own greed and with the belief in their own power and domination. They challenged the integrity of practically the entire civilized world. America and her President bore with patience the countless edicts and overbearings of the German authorities until the final command of what America could or could not do. These final commands and edicts of the German Kaiser went to the humiliation and destruction of the very soul of the Nation, and Woodrow Wilson and the American Congress drew the sword and the conflict was on.

I have not time to trace the various campaigns and battles of this gigantic struggle, but it is not difficult to recall the courage and hope, as well as determination and new life, which permeated the allied nations when on June 26, 1917, the American commander, Gen. John J. Pershing, landed with the first American Expeditionary Forces in France, and stood at the tomb of America's old friend LaFayette and said: "LaFayette, we are here." Yes; the American soldiers were there, and they continued to swarm on European soil and so replenished and strengthened the allied line, which was bent within 44 miles of Paris, until instead of breaking, the line swung back to the Hindenburg stronghold.

The death toll was great, but the Kaiser had fled to neutral Holland. Thrones crumbled and crowns were tossed as trophies in the path of Woodrow Wilson, the President of the mightiest Nation on earth; his 14 points came forth in all of their strength; the world was once more safe for the democratic nations of mankind in America, in the world; yes, in Europe and in Flanders fields, where poppies grow.

[Speech of Congressman R. A. GREEN, of Starke, Fla., delivered over Radio Station WJAX, October 16, 1930, at 7.30 p. m., Jacksonville, Fla.]

NATIONAL LEGISLATION FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Recently I have received so many requests relative to provisions of the recent act of Congress for Spanish-American War veterans that I have concluded that it would be well to take a few minutes to discuss this all-important subject.

Ever since the early days of our Republic it has been the policy of the United States Government to extend all possible measures of relief to the war veterans who have defended our Nation in time of peril, and, of course, this has properly obtained relative to the soldiers of the war with Spain.

These veterans waited more than 20 years after the treaty of peace with the Spanish Government before a pension law was passed for their relief. This law has been amended and liberalized from time to time. Upon the convening of the Seventy-first Congress, several Spanish-American pension bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate. Hearings were held by the pension committees. Representatives of the veterans' organizations, high State officials, Members of the Congress and Senate, as well as numbers of other persons appeared before the committees, urging that adequate and liberal provisions be incorporated in such bill as was reported. It appeared for a while that we would be able to obtain report by the committees of a bill allowing a minimum pension of \$50 for all veterans of this war, but after extended hearings and considerable discussion, a compromise bill was agreed upon and finally passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President.

Under the provisions of this bill all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition, and who have been honorably discharged, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character which so incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor as to render them un-

able to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensions of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$60 a month and not less than \$20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated.

These rates to be fixed as follows: \$20 a month for one-tenth disability; \$25 a month for one-fourth disability; \$35 a month for one-half disability; \$50 a month for three-fourths disability; and \$60 a month for total. *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact be placed upon the pension roll and entitled to receive a pension of \$30 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 68 years, \$40 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 72 years, \$50 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, \$60 a month.

The legislation also provides that if a veteran on account of age or physical or mental disability is helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid or attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$72 per month. He is not, however, entitled to this additional \$12 per month for an attendant if he himself is an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home.

Also an entirely new feature of this bill is the inclusion of veterans who served 70 days or more, and who have become disabled from other causes than in line of duty. These veterans are entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$30 a month and not less than \$12 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated. These rates to be fixed as follows: \$12 a month for one-tenth disability; \$15 a month for one-fourth disability; \$18 a month for one-half disability; \$24 a month for three-fourths disability; and \$30 a month for total. *Provided*, That any person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll and entitled to receive a pension of \$12 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 68 years, \$18 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 72 years, \$24 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, \$30 a month.

I would like to stress the fact that while these increases are certain, yet it is necessary for veterans desiring to receive them to file application for same. The increase dates from the time application for same is filed with the Pension Bureau, and may I suggest that all Spanish-American War veterans who come under the provisions of this act, and who have not filed for increase, should do so promptly. Requests for application blanks should be sent either to the Bureau of Pensions, Washington, D. C., or to the Member of Congress from your district. There are hundreds of Spanish-American War veterans in our State who have never applied for pension, though many of them have 10 per cent or greater disability, and may I urge that all such veterans who are not now receiving pensions, or who have not applied for pension, promptly do so. May I also suggest that at any time when a pensioner who is not receiving the maximum benefits of the law feels that his disabilities have increased, he may file an application for increase of his pension. Ninety days must elapse between the last ruling of the Pension Bureau on application for pension or increase thereof, before a new application or increase application may be filed. It has been my experience with a large number of cases that even though the first application for increase was not allowed by the bureau, a second or third application is often allowed for the reason that the disabilities of veterans who have passed the age of 48 or 50 often increase rapidly. I urge that all Spanish-American War veterans make an earnest and honest effort to obtain all benefits to which the law entitles them.

Another good provision of existing law is the provision for pensioning of the veteran's widow after his death. If she married the veteran prior to September 1, 1922, and was living with him as his wife at the time of his death, she is entitled to a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, so long as she lives or until she has remarried. The widow is also entitled to receive any accrued pension which may be due the soldier at the time of his death. Each child of a deceased veteran, under the age of 16 years, is also entitled to \$6 per month.

Another provision of existing law is an allowance of not more than \$107 for burial expenses of veterans. In some cases where no widow survives to claim the accrued pension, if any, and where the veteran dies without estate, it has been applied toward the expenses of the last illness and burial.

My friends, I have gone rather into detail relative to the provisions of these laws, but I deem it highly important for all veterans and their families to be fully informed as to all of their just benefits.

To many of the relief provisions for the Spanish-American War veterans, we have had to overcome rather strong opposition. There are still many persons who believe that our Government has been entirely too liberal in pensioning soldiers; in fact, there are many citizens of our country who are opposed entirely to any form of pension. But we do not have to search history at length to learn of offers and sacrifices which were made by the "boys of '98."

In 1895 there were many wealthy Cubans living in the United States, as well as a large number of citizens of the United States temporarily residing in Cuba. At this time there was a revolt against the operation of the then ruling class in Cuba. Of

course, the American citizens sympathized with the oppressed, and these things led to a general ill feeling of the ruling class in Cuba against the United States and her citizens. So intense did this feeling grow that the United States Government deemed it necessary to send the battleship *Maine* to the harbor of Habana to protect our American citizens and their property in Cuba.

You can easily recall that on February 15, 1898, the battleship *Maine* was blown up while quietly anchored in the harbor of Habana, and 260 members of her crew went to their watery grave in the land of their enemy. For this blowing up of the battleship *Maine*, the United States Government held the Spanish Government responsible, though it was said the actual accomplishment of its destruction was by half a dozen subordinate Spanish officers.

On March 9, 1898, the Congress of the United States placed \$50,000,000 at the disposal of the President for national defense. On April 11, 1898, the President of the United States asked for authority to intervene in Cuban affairs. He was, on April 20, authorized to do so. On April 22, a blockade of the Spanish part of the island was ordered. On April 23, the President called for 125,000 volunteers and the call was promptly answered by American citizens throughout the United States. In rapid succession the few battles of the Spanish-American War followed. On May 1, in Manila Harbor, the American squadron under Commodore Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet. Admiral William Sampson and Admiral W. S. Schley proceeded to blockade the Cuban coast and literally combed the waters of the lower Atlantic for Admiral Cervera's fleet. On May 28, Cervera's fleet was blockaded in the harbor of Santiago, and a naval siege began. And well do we remember how history records the daring feat of Lieut. Richard Pierson Hobson, an Alabamian by birth and residence, accompanied by several seamen, took the *Merrimac* in the mouth of the harbor and sank it. He and his companions escaped as best they could to regions of safety. This daring feat of Lieutenant Hobson bottled up the mighty fleet of Cervera and put an end to the Atlantic warfare of the Spanish Navy.

And well do we remember how history records General Shafter's skilled activities. He organized an army at Tampa, Fla., landed near Santiago June 22, and advanced westward to El Caney and San Juan Hill. Here on July 3, with Col. Theodore Roosevelt at Kettle Hill, the American troops gave terror and destruction to the Spanish land forces.

Our American soldiers were subjected to insanitary conditions in a foreign and tropical country. Yellow fever and diseases of almost all kinds raged, and while the death toll was not unusually large, thousands of our soldiers contracted diseases and sicknesses which they carry with them to-day. They answered the call of President McKinley; they crossed the waters to a foreign land; took their chances as to results without question, and their patriotism, courage, bravery, and general demeanor as American soldiers has never been questioned. They offered all they had and defended our flag in what, at that time, appeared to be a war of vast importance. How well they performed their tasks, and how diligently their duties were performed, individually and collectively, is told by the prompt manner in which they brought Spain to terms of peace, and with which they upheld the dignity and supremacy of the American flag.

Florida boasts no better citizenship than that of her Spanish-American veterans; they are always awake to, and active for, all things for the best interest of Florida. They, through their State organization, first suggested to me Florida's desire for a branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. At their suggestion I introduced the bill and worked for its passage in the House of Representatives. Their camps, the American Legion posts, the Medical Association of Florida, in fact a united Florida was able to finally obtain passage of the Fletcher-Green bill in the House and in the Senate and I hope this same cooperation will finally land this branch home in our State.

These veterans are representative of America's highest type of citizenship.

My friends, I believe they are entitled to the pensions which have been granted them. I further believe that even more liberal provisions should and will be accorded them as the years pass and their memory carries them back to El Caney, San Juan Hill, Santiago, and Manila.

[Speech by Congressman R. A. GREEN, of Starke, Fla., delivered over radio station WJAX, Jacksonville, Fla., October 30, at 7:30 p. m.]

GOVERNMENT POSITIONS AND RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Due to the unusually large number of requests which I have recently received from young men and women of our State desiring employment with the Government I have concluded to take a few minutes to discuss the methods of obtaining Government positions and to also discuss briefly the provisions of the civil service retirement act.

The unusual conditions, financially and industrially, now existing in our country, and which have existed for the past many months, have for many reasons caused a large number of our citizens to seek employment with the Government. Almost daily I receive appeals from worthy persons of our State requesting information as to how to obtain a position with the Government.

It happens that practically all Government positions, except a few of the higher administrative, appointive places, are filled through and as a result of civil-service examinations. The civil service act, I believe, was passed during the administration of President Arthur about the year 1881, and it was hoped would

bring remedy to the spoils system which was begun by President Andrew Jackson. How well the civil service has cured the spoils system I leave to the judgment of those who are familiar with political party affairs and the general practice in securing Government appointments. In the beginning some 14,000 offices were classified and placed under the civil service. Later on Theodore Roosevelt was made the civil-service commissioner, and it was largely through his efforts as commissioner, and later as President of the United States, that he was able to place some 234,000 offices under the civil service. Of course, since that time (1902) the number of civil-service offices has been largely increased.

These thousands of Federal offices are open to the citizens of the United States for competitive examination. The age limit for applicants usually runs from 18 years or 21 years to not more than 50 years. The age limit for some positions, as that of railway mail clerk, I believe, is 35 years.

Any Florida citizen desiring a Government position should write to the Hon. John T. Doyle, secretary Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., advising him of the line of work desired and requesting application blank and information, including date of future examinations.

These examinations are held in places throughout the country. They may be written or oral or in the form of a questionnaire to be filled out, this depending upon the position the applicant is seeking. After the examination is completed, the results are forwarded to the United States Civil Service Commission, there graded, and applicants making the required passing grade are given a place on the civil-service register, according to the grade made. In most cases the passing grade is 70 per cent; however, war veterans are allowed 5 per cent added to their grade for their military service. If a disabled veteran, then 10 per cent is added. In other words, a disabled veteran who made on his examination a grade of 65 per cent would have 10 per cent added to it, thus giving him a final grade of 75 per cent. The final grade of a veteran being equal to the final grade of any other applicant, the veteran also is entitled to preference in appointment. For practically all examinations the age limit is also waived for men who have had military or naval service.

As employees are needed by the Government departments, for which the examination is held, the names from the civil-service register are certified to such department. Such certification, of course, begins at the top of the register and each time the names of the three with highest grades are certified the department choosing one of the three. The other two names will, however, be certified again later. And, as a usual thing, if an applicant obtains a good passing mark his or her name is certified and appointment is eventually obtained. Of course, not all who pass the examinations are called for positions, because oftentimes many more will qualify than are needed for the limited number of positions to be filled. However, my experience is that almost any deserving and qualified person can, by perseverance and taking one or more of these examinations, finally obtain a position with the Government.

A few Government positions are occasionally filled outside of the civil service, but these appointments are controlled by such party as is in power. Of course, at this time the Democratic Party is not in control of the administration; therefore, the only channel through which we may hope to obtain appointment for our Democratic friends is through the civil-service examinations. Any further information may be had by writing to Secretary Doyle or to the Member of Congress from your district.

Almost all Government employees who obtain their positions as a result of civil-service examination come under the provisions of the Federal Civil Service retirement law. After many years of earnest effort by the civil-service employees and their friends in Congress a law for old-age and disability retirement of civil-service employees was enacted May 22, 1920, becoming effective August 1, 1920. This act provided for a maximum annual retirement pay of \$720. The law was further amended in 1926 providing for a maximum retirement pay of \$1,000 per annum. However, on May 29, 1930, we were able to enact an amendment to the retirement law which provides as high as \$1,200 per annum for worthy Federal employees who meet its requirements. The first section of this last amendment, in part, reads as follows:

"All employees to whom this act applies who, before its effective date, shall have attained or shall thereafter attain the age of 70 years and rendered at least 15 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act shall be eligible for retirement on an annuity as provided for in this act: *Provided*, That city, rural, and village letter carriers, post-office clerks, sea-post clerks, employees of the Indian Service at large excepting clerks, laborers, and mechanics generally shall, under like conditions, be eligible for retirement at 65 years of age, and that railway postal clerks, mechanics, and laborers in navy yards, including leading men and quartermen but excluding master mechanics and foremen, and those employees engaged in pursuits whose occupation is hazardous or requires great physical effort, or which necessitates exposure to extreme heat or cold, and those employees whose terms of service shall include 15 years or more of such service rendered in the Tropics, shall be eligible at 62 years of age; the classification of employees for the purpose of assignment to the various age groups shall be determined jointly by the Civil Service Commission and the head of the department, branch, or independent office of the Government concerned: *Provided further*, That any such employee who was employed as a mechanic for the major portion of his service, and not less than 15 years, and was subsequent to August 20, 1920, involuntarily transferred to employment as a laborer and thereafter involuntarily discharged from the service of the United States, shall receive such annuity as he would have been entitled

to if on the day of his discharge from the service he had been retired under the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That any mechanic, having served 30 years, who was, through no fault of his own, transferred or reduced to a minor position, and who shall have attained or who shall thereafter attain the age of 62 years, shall have his annuity computed upon his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation for the last 10 years of his service as a mechanic: *Provided further*, That the term "mechanics," as used in this act, shall include all employees in the Government Printing Office whose duties are to supervise, perform, or assist in apprentice, helper, or journeyman work of a recognized trade or craft, as determined by the Public Printer."

While the general retirement age is 70 years, yet for certain classes of service this age is reduced. For instance, a rural letter carrier may retire at the age of 65 years if he has had at least 15 years of service. Or he may retire at the age of 63 years if he has had 30 years of service. While the act specifies certain retirement ages, yet employees attaining these ages may continue their services for 2 or even 4 years if they apply for such continuance, and if their physical condition is such as to enable them to continue rendering satisfactory and efficient services.

The act also carries a provision for disability retirement. Persons who have had five years or more of service and become totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position occupied by such person, by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the employee, shall upon his own application or upon the request or order of the head of the department, branch, or independent office concerned, be retired.

The disability retirement pay, and, in fact, the retirement pay of any employee, is, of course, rated in accordance with the length of time the employee has served, the amount of his annual contribution and interest thereon, a portion of his average basic salary or compensation received during any five-consecutive-year periods of his services, etc.

Those who are not employees of the Government, and who are not otherwise familiar with Government retirement policy, wonder where the retirement funds come from, and they will be interested in knowing that the some 400,000 civil-service employees who come within the purview of the law, pay into the retirement fund 3½ per cent of their salary, which amounts to more than \$28,000,000 annually.

These funds are deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund, and is there deposited in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller of the United States. In the main, retirement annuities are paid from these moneys, and the fact that this great fund is securely and safely deposited in the United States Treasury is a source of great comfort to the almost half million employees who are annually contributing to same and who anticipate eventually receiving the most generous benefits. The Secretary of the Treasury may invest the civil service retirement and disability fund in interest-bearing securities, but such income as is derived from such investments must be placed back into the said fund, thus bringing to these worthy workers all possible protection and benefit.

Of course, the law carries provisions for return to the employee or his dependents amounts which have been deducted from his annual salary in case of his separation from the service by death or other causes.

To me the civil service retirement law seems most worthy and noble in principle. It gives that old-age security to the employees which is so conducive not only to their comfort and contentment but also to their best service for the Government while they are able to perform. We find to-day that many large industrial concerns are providing retirement funds to be paid monthly to their employees who have served with them for a period of years and who reach required ages. We also have numerous industrial insurance companies which encourage savings of persons during the earning period of life; but in spite of all of this effort and precaution on the part of our Government, our States, and the various industrial and insurance companies of our country, we find that about 85 per cent of all persons 65 years old or more are wholly impoverished and dependent upon public bounty for support.

In the United States to-day there are some three million such persons. By this it seems that this 85 per cent of our old aged have been by misfortune or otherwise rendered without estate in their declining years. Hundreds of thousands of these have contributed during their earning period of life to the industrial, social, economic, spiritual, and general civic life of their respective communities, but in old age find themselves a charge depending upon the charity of their fellow men. This unusual condition has brought, in 10 or more States of our Union, what is known as an old-age pension. Notable among these States are Kentucky, Colorado, Maryland, California, Minnesota, Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts. Many of these old-age pension laws allow approximately \$1 per day for persons 70 years of age or older and who have an estate worth less than \$3,000, and whose income is under \$400 per year. Arizona, I believe, was the first State to establish an old-age pension law, some twenty years ago. Thus it will be seen that this policy of protection and care for the aged is rapidly advancing in our country. The laws of the various States vary. In some cases the county and city contributes one-third or one-half and the State the balance. In some cases the State contributes one-third and the local county and/or city two-thirds.

We have in Florida certain provision for old age or for those who are otherwise incapable of maintenance and support but thus far Federal sanction has not been obtained for a Federal old-age

pension; however, to-day there is a great sentiment in the United States for an old-age pension. Of course, I am unable to predict what proportions this sentiment may take. There are many debatable phases of the question—its constitutionality, its general feasibility, its ultimate effect upon the strength of the industrial citizenship of the Nation, and various phases. However, the sentiment for a Federal old-age pension is undoubtedly growing.

Apart from the subject of civil service and retirement of Federal employees, I will claim your attention just long enough to remind you that the Federal Government has in the past few years dealt rather liberally with Florida in Federal moneys expended for Federal buildings. Besides the actual expenditure for Federal building projects for the last five years of some \$500,000, we have been able to obtain authorizations for new construction in the amount of about \$6,834,000. These funds have been allocated as follows: Daytona Beach, \$285,000; Jacksonville, \$2,575,000; Key West, \$559,000; Kissimmee, \$80,000; Lake City, \$125,000; Lakeland, \$90,000; Marianna, \$50,000; Miami, \$2,145,000; Palm Beach, \$200,000; Sarasota, \$175,000; Tampa, \$550,000.

It is apparent from this expenditure that Florida has not been forgotten by the Federal Government in its post-office building program.

WIDOWS' ANNUITY

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of widows' annuity, together with a letter I received relating to the same subject as the result of a letter written by myself seeking certain information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress—the regular session—and after many uncertain moments, legislation known as the Lehlbach bill, amending the existing retirement laws in many important respects, was passed. The Lehlbach bill materially changed the original retirement act of 1920 and the amendments later made thereto. In fact, it practically changed the whole theory upon which our retirement legislation had been founded. The new policy that this bill established is an excellent one, and one that meets with the approval and satisfaction of practically all persons in the Federal service who are covered by the law. The Lehlbach bill established a fundamental retirement policy which will be lasting, and, as conditions warrant, it can be amended without in any way changing the fundamental principles which the law established.

It is only natural and proper that from time to time such legislation will have to be amended to meet changes in conditions that may occur or to equitably carry out the intent of the legislation. During the hearings on the Lehlbach bill before the House Committee on the Civil Service, of which I am a member, I strongly suggested the consideration, either at that time or later, of a provision providing for a widows' annuity. While I realized that such a provision might not receive such consideration at that time to become a part of the then pending bill, the subject of a widows' annuity was strongly suggested by me so that those interested could give it serious thought, so that sometime in the near future, if it appealed to those in the Federal service, Members of the Congress, and other interested persons, it could gain their support and some day become operative in law by an amendment making it a part of the present retirement system that the Lehlbach bill established.

I can see no objection to a provision in every retirement law leaving it to the discretion of the employee covered by the law to provide an annuity for his wife in the event she should survive him. It is only natural and proper that a husband should want to make some provision if possible for his wife, who has taken life's journey with him, in the event she should outlive him.

It is also quite probable in a great many cases when a man reaches retirement age, and he is still blessed with the presence of his wife, that they knowing the physical condition of each other would have a good idea as to which one is likely to survive the other. Assuredly if the husband realized that in all probability he would receive the "great call" before his wife, he would want to make some arrangement, if possible, that would provide for her after the separation takes place. Furthermore, if conditions were such that there was no knowledge as to which one would first journey onward, a careful, prudent, considerate, thoughtful

husband would, if possible, make provisions that would assure some protection of his wife in the event she outlived him. Such a law would have to be drafted in such a manner as to protect adequately and equitably the interests of all concerned.

It is not my purpose to discuss the details of such legislation, but simply to refer to the principle involved with the hope that the subject matter will receive serious consideration, and some time in the near future become incorporated into law.

Such legislation could be drafted, leaving it discretionary with the employee whether he would permit it to apply to him or not, without any additional expense to the Government.

The city of Boston has a retirement law which permits one covered by it, at or about the time of his retirement, and in his discretion, to provide an annuity for his wife in the event she should survive him. This system has worked during the past eight years in a manner that meets with the approval and satisfaction of both employees and the city.

Recently I sent a letter to the chairman of the retirement board of the city of Boston, Wilfred J. Doyle, who is also city clerk of Boston, asking for information as to the manner in which provision for widows' annuities operated.

Mr. Doyle is recognized as one of the leading experts on retirement legislation in the United States. He sent me the following reply, which I am inserting in the RECORD for consideration by those who are interested in such legislation. It is a very interesting letter, and shows clearly the effectiveness of the widows' annuity provision in the city of Boston retirement act:

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Boston, January 5, 1931.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your question as to the value of optional benefits in pension and retirement systems I submit the following observations based on eight years' experience as chairman of the retirement board of the retirement system of the city of Boston:

In our system upon retiring a member is entitled to a retirement allowance payable monthly, varying in amount, depending on his length of service and age at retirement. If he takes the allowance without options, the payments cease upon his death.

The retiring member has, however, the privilege of accepting a lesser amount and varying his pension by one of the three following methods:

1. Reduced payments during life, with the provision that in case of death before such payments have equaled the present value of pension and annuity at date of retirement the balance shall be paid to his estate.

2. Reduced payments covering two lives, with the provision that at the death of the retired member the same payments shall be continued throughout the life of such other person having an insurable interest in his life as the member shall have designated at the time of his retirement.

3. Reduced payments covering two lives, with the provision that at the death of the retired member one-half of the amount of his benefits shall be continued throughout the life of such other person having an insurable interest in his life as the member shall have designated at the time of his retirement.

The reduction in amount of retirement allowance required by the choice of one of these options averages approximately 20 per cent.

In theory, although the transaction does not actually take place, the pensioner, upon being entitled to a certain annual pension, pays back a portion of it for the purpose in option 1 of purchasing a diminishing life insurance on his own life, and in options 2 and 3 of purchasing an annuity based on two lives.

One-fourth of all the employees retired during the eight years the Boston system has been in existence have taken either option 1 or option 2. The number taking option 3 is negligible.

For the retiring employee with a wife or other dependents the value of the option is obvious, and it has been our experience that a very large proportion of the employees so situated make provision for their dependents by selecting an option.

We consider the optional benefits a very valuable element in the retirement system provided that it is distinctly understood that it is merely a method of affording the pensioner, after he has retired, an opportunity of devoting a portion of his pension to the purchase of a form of insurance for his dependents at the cheapest possible cost. For that reason it is provided that an optional benefit is not effective until 30 days after the application for retirement is received. This provision appears in practically all retirement systems having optional benefits, and 30 days has apparently been selected as a convenient period although 60 days might perhaps be better.

Unless this restriction is placed on optional selections, an employee on his deathbed could make an application for retirement, choosing option 1, and naturally no employee would voluntarily retire, so long as he could stay in the service at full pay, until he felt that death was imminent.

It is evident that the effect of neglecting to provide for a time restriction on optional benefits is to convert a pension system for the benefit of the employee into an insurance system for the benefit of his dependents or his estate. This was shown by the experience of one of the New York systems which started without any 30-day clause on its optional benefits, and on account of various abuses and the failure of the system to function properly found it necessary to have its charter amended and the 30-day restriction inserted.

It is my opinion that the optional benefit clauses in the Boston retirement system, with the conditions attached as described previously, is of great benefit not only to the employees but also to the city.

Yours very truly,

W. J. DOYLE,

City Clerk and Chairman Boston Retirement Board.

This subject particularly deserves the thoughtful consideration of all Federal employees covered by the Lehlbach bill and by Members of Congress, all of whom are anxious to see enacted into law legislation relating to those in the Federal service that will bring to them in this case, without additional expense to employees of the Government, the greatest amount of happiness and contentment when they are approaching the retirement age, in the knowledge that should they receive the "great call" first proper provisions for the maintenance of their wives will have been made.

NAMING NAVAL VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein an historical narrative which appeared recently in the Daily Herald, of Gulfport and Biloxi, Miss., giving a brief history of the city of Biloxi and reasons why it would be appropriate to name one of the new naval vessels or aircraft carriers "Biloxi" in honor of this beautiful and historic city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following historical narrative of the City of Biloxi, Miss., appearing in the Biloxi-Gulfport Herald under recent date. The object of the publication is to present the name of Biloxi as appropriate for one of the new naval vessels or aircraft carriers.

BILOXI AND BATTLESHIPS

Congressman ROBERT HALL, of the district, thinks that he may be able to bestow the name "Biloxi" on a new naval craft or aircraft carrier. Moved by a request by Anthony Ragusin, secretary of the Biloxi Chamber of Commerce, he has communicated with the Secretary of the Navy and the Mississippi congressional delegation to that end.

If nomenclature policy of the department is to honor cities of the country in this way, the three ancient cities of St. Augustine in the Spanish land of Ponce de Leon, Biloxi in the region of the French d'berville, and Santa Fe in the mysterious land of the Conquistadores of Spain, should be selected. The great territory of French, Spanish, and English along the Gulf of Mexico has a history of its own forming a romantic part of the historical whole of this great country, and that surrounding Santa Fe and leading to its extension from parent country in 1848 under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, never can be adequately told. As the flags of seven nations have waved over the territory of which Biloxi is a part, a beginning of what has been a storm center; as others have waved over Santa Fe and St. Augustine; and as all three—now standing, not "grim, gloomy, and peculiar," as Napoleon was pictured by Phillips, but free, open, and progressive in an age not so confined, but stronger than any turreted castle with moat and knightly arms—as these three claim precedent settlement among the cities of the Nation so they are worthy of the honor of having named for them some naval craft.

We present particularly the claim of Biloxi, and if the Secretary of the Navy, whose assistant, Mr. Jahncke, knows this city as a neighbor, decide to let its name appear upon such craft, on hull and flag, the distinction will be both deserved and highly appreciated and cherished.

ADDRESS BY PROF. H. R. TOLLEY

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address by Prof. H. R. Tolley on the subject of regional

readjustments in agriculture, delivered at the annual meeting of the land-grant colleges in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Prof. H. R. Tolley of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, University of California, and formerly Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, at the convention of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities at Washington, D. C., on November 17, 1930.

The address is as follows:

ECONOMIC READJUSTMENTS OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The problem of economic readjustments in American agriculture is not a new problem. Readjustments due to changes in economic conditions have been under way continuously since agriculture was first established in this country. Only in the last decade, however, has the problem come to the foreground in the work of the agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. It has been receiving more and more attention in recent years, and now is considered by many to be the fundamental problem of American agriculture.

This association heard at its meeting three years ago to-day a report on the agricultural situation prepared by a special committee of its members. Two of the principal points stressed in that report were control of agricultural surpluses and individual farm adjustments. "Adjustments of acreages and of numbers of livestock" was mentioned first among the lines of attack on agricultural surpluses. In the discussion of individual farm adjustments this statement was made: "Organized research and educational agencies should take definite steps to stimulate what appear to be desirable farm adjustments." If we only knew what adjustments are desirable, that statement might be the theme of this paper.

I

As a result of the emphasis on economic research in the last decade, the workers in the agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture now have a very good understanding of the economic situation as it affects agriculture. Most farmers now realize that farming is a highly competitive industry, that each agricultural producer must meet the competition not only of his fellow farmers in this country but of producers in foreign countries as well, and that in the long run the income from his farming operations and the standard of living of his family will be determined by his ability to compete with producers in other areas and other countries. Farmers' knowledge and realization of these facts has come in no small measure from the information that has reached them through Federal and State channels.

Farmers and agricultural workers believe that somehow it should be possible to keep agricultural production more nearly in tune with changing economic conditions, and that somehow it should be possible for the farmers in those parts of the country where soil, topography and rainfall are suitable for agriculture, to develop systems of farming and methods of operations that will enable them to make satisfactory incomes and have an American standard of living, even in the face of excessive competition, such as we have been experiencing in the past decade. But there is where we stop.

Farmers do not know and we do not know what systems of farming and methods of production would enable those in each area to compete most successfully under present and prospective economic conditions. During the past decade conditions have been changing so rapidly that even the most capable forward-looking farmers have been unable, by the process of trial and error, to revise old systems and methods radically enough to make them suitable to present conditions. And it seems that the research and extension workers have lacked either vision, or ability, or funds, to provide the farmers of the country with the information that will enable them to make the necessary readjustments.

Doubtless, in some areas of low productivity where farming is now being carried on, even the best adjustments possible would not enable the farmers to make satisfactory incomes. Such areas are of course submarginal for agriculture and steps should be taken by the Federal and State Governments to get such areas out of agricultural use and to keep them out. But in all except comparatively few of the areas now devoted to agriculture, farming can and should continue. The question is: What kind of farming? What changes and readjustments are needed?

We know that there are areas in both the Winter Wheat Belt and Spring Wheat Belt where wheat can be produced profitably year in and year out with prices no higher than those which have prevailed in recent years, provided the farms are organized right, the right kind of equipment is used, and the farmer has the ability to manage large acreages and expensive equipment. And similarly for other commodities: Cotton, fruit, dairy products, and beef cattle. But just to say we believe it is possible to produce this commodity or that commodity profitably does not help the situation. We need to know where it can be done and how to do it.

To be sure, we hope and expect that the markets for agricultural products will be better in the years just ahead than they have been during the past year, but many drastic readjustments would be necessary to enable the bulk of our farmers to make satisfactory returns, even with conditions as good as they were in the best year for agriculture in the last decade.

II

Some of us, when considering the problem as it appears in the State or region in which we are interested, comfort ourselves by thinking that our region is the most favored one and that after all we can compete successfully with any other region or State or Nation in the production of any commodity we choose to produce. Thus we find the eastern Cotton Belt continuing to produce cotton and expanding its production on the least provocation in the face of a great expansion in the western part of the belt, the East apparently thinking that it can outcompete the West. I dare say that some whose duty it is to provide the farmers of their States with facts to guide them in their operations have given encouragement to this point of view.

At the same time we find that producers in the western part of the belt have continued to increase their production, knowing all the time that producers in the East are producing as much cotton as ever with no apparent intention of curtailment. And doubtless the cotton producers of the West have been told by representatives of their public agencies to which they look for advice on agricultural matters that their conditions are much more favorable than conditions in the eastern belt, and that as the West continues to expand, the East will gradually withdraw from competition.

There is a similar attitude with regard to competition between regions in the production of many commodities. In egg production we find the Northeastern States saying they can outcompete the Pacific coast, and vice versa. And so on.

This attitude on the part of producers who can not have first-hand information regarding conditions in distant parts of the country or the world is perhaps understandable. But for an employee of a public agency, created to discover facts that will be helpful to farmers and to bring these facts to the farmer's attention, to take such an attitude is inexcusable.

In the long run the producers in the areas which have the greatest comparative advantage for the production of a commodity will survive and those in unfavorable areas will pass out of the picture. To encourage the continuance or expansion of production in an unfavorable high-cost area simply "prolongs the agony" and increases the costs of readjustments. Through research we should strive to determine the areas where the different commodities can be produced most advantageously and through extension hasten sound readjustments and lower their cost to society.

III

The members of the Federal Farm Board seem to have come to the conclusion that adjustments in production rather than changes in the marketing system is the fundamental agricultural problem. A single year's experience in administering the agricultural marketing act evidently convinced the board that "surplus control" can come only through adjustments in production; that reorganization of the agricultural marketing machinery and financial aid to marketing agencies alone will not accomplish the purposes of the act. Let me quote a few statements which have emanated from the Farm Board in the past few months.

Mr. Christensen said in a radio talk on September 27, "Along with its efforts to develop strong cooperative marketing associations, the [Federal] Farm Board has attacked vigorously the difficult problem of acreage adjustment. Unregulated, unsystematic production can and has nullified the benefits of efficient marketing."

Mr. Stone announced in his talk before the American Institute of Cooperation last summer:

"We also expect to make a study of the various sections of the country and bring to the attention of the farmers of each section the crops and livestock they can produce to better advantage than in other sections." Mr. Stone gave no details as to the plans for this study, the personnel to be employed, or the methods to be followed, and I believe no further public pronouncement has been made by Mr. Stone or any other member of the board. Possibly, on further consideration, the board found that it does not have on its staff, and can not obtain, enough agricultural-production economists to carry out such a project. Mr. Stone was absolutely right when he said in the same address that a study of this kind is of vital importance to the solution of the agricultural problem. But the agricultural colleges and the Department of Agriculture are in a much better position and are much better equipped than the Farm Board to make this study.

We all know of Mr. Legge's personal appeals last summer to the wheat growers in all parts of the country to adjust wheat acreage. He has stressed the importance of readjustments in all lines of production in many public statements since that time. In an address before the mortgage bankers' association on September 18, he said, "One of the largest problems is to promote the adjustment of farm organization and practice to actual and prospective conditions." Mr. Legge has also been stressing the need for adjustments in size of farm and the adoption of farming practices that will insure economical production. In this address to the mortgage bankers he said, "The time has passed when wheat can be grown profitably on small acreages." In an address to the Boston Chamber of Commerce on October 30, Mr. Legge again discussed the need for adjustments in production, emphasizing

adjustments in the size of farms and the use of modern machinery and low-cost production practices.

For the Farm Board, created primarily to assist farmers in their marketing problems, to reach the conclusion so promptly that substantial improvement must await readjustments in production, may be gratifying to those of us who have been giving major attention to research and extension designed to facilitate farm adjustments, but we sincerely hope that the members of the board are not expecting us to tell them at this time just what readjustments should be made in crop acreages, in numbers of livestock, in farm sizes, and in production methods, in each of the different agricultural regions of the country.

IV

I doubt if many of us realize all that would be involved in determining just what readjustments would have to be made in each of the farming areas of the country in order for the farmers of the area to have incomes that would afford them an American standard of living under present conditions.

One very important change that will be necessary in most areas is an upward adjustment in the size of farms. Farm organization and management studies in all parts of the country have shown many farms to be so small that even with the best choice of enterprises and with the most effective methods of production, incomes under present conditions would not be large enough to enable the farmer to provide his family a satisfactory standard of living and meet the financial obligations incurred in operating his farm and attaining ownership of it. In fact, most of the farms to-day in every section of the country are too small for economical operation.

In those types of farming where machinery plays an important part, recent developments make larger farms imperative. In such areas it is almost necessary that a farmer take advantage of the latest developments in machinery if he is to compete successfully, and a comparatively large acreage is necessary to make the use of expensive machinery economical. Much readjustment in sizes of farms has already taken place in areas where recently developed machines have been generally adopted. But even in those areas where the greatest progress has been made, many further adjustments are needed. Let me give you an example of the very great readjustment that may be necessary in Corn Belt farming to secure the best combination of land and labor with recently developed equipment.

The Doane Agricultural Service, with the assistance of some of the farm economists and agricultural engineers of the Corn Belt, is endeavoring to determine the most economical unit for Corn Belt farming with mechanical power. This agency acts as consultant and manager for many Corn Belt properties, and expects to put into practice the results of its findings. Mr. Doane tells me that he now believes this unit will contain 1,200 acres of crops. The power would be furnished by one heavy tractor for plowing, disking, etc., and three general-purpose tractors for cultivating and other light work. Both a mechanical corn picker and a combined harvester-thresher would be used.

Mr. Doane says he considers that working out of the best unit of organization for Corn Belt farming is one of the most important pieces of work he has ever undertaken.

This tentative conclusion that the economic unit contains 1,200 acres—the equivalent of about 10 average Corn Belt farms—has been reached by a man the success of whose business depends upon his being able to organize and manage farms so that they will return profits to their owners. Hence it is not by any means "just the dream of a visionary enthusiast." It may be that in parts of the Corn Belt readjustments are pending which will be even more striking than those which became possible in the wheat belt when the combine and the tractor were perfected, and which are now necessary because wheat producers all over the world are turning to the use of these machines.

Many other examples of readjustments made possible by new machines might be cited. I understand that there have been some rather remarkable developments in the adaptation of machinery to sugar-beet production which give some promise of making sugar beets profitable in areas where they will not be able to find a place as long as the present high-cost production methods are used. A promising experiment in the cooperative use of machinery and mechanical power is being carried on by a number of Wisconsin farmers under the auspices of the economics and engineering departments of the college of agriculture of that State.

The need for readjustment in size of unit is not confined to those types of farming for which new and improved machines have recently become available. To illustrate: Only a fraction of the specialized poultry producers of the country keep flocks of more than a thousand hens. An annual income of \$1.25 to \$1.50 a hen, after paying cash operating expenses, is about the best that can be expected under present conditions even with the best management, in the most-favored areas, and with continued keen competition in prospect it does not seem that the income per hen can be materially increased. A thousand hens at \$1.25 a hen will yield only \$1,250 a year to take care of depreciation and upkeep to the plant, accumulate savings or retire indebtedness, and support the farm family. Obviously, in such cases, an upward adjustment in size of flock is the only alternative to what we would all consider an unsatisfactory standard of living.

The problem of agricultural readjustments is in many respects a farm-management problem. There has been great progress in farm-management work since it began 20 years ago, but, even so, the farm-management workers have not as yet reached any very definite conclusions as to the areas where different commodities

can be produced to the best advantage. Nor have they made many recommendations concerning readjustments in types of farming, technique of production, and size of farm that will enable farmers to make satisfactory incomes under present conditions.

As far as the outlook work is concerned we are compelled to agree with the statement made by Director Bliss of Iowa before this association last year: "Outlook reports and outlook conferences are valuable from the standpoint of education but of small consequence from the standpoint of influencing production." The outlook conferences and outlook reports have been very valuable and will continue to be very valuable in enabling farmers and workers in the agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture to understand the economic situation, to know what changes are occurring, and what the trend of future events is likely to be, but much more information than has yet been included in an outlook report is needed for determining the commodities that can be produced to best advantage in a particular area and the best methods of producing them.

Considering other phases of work in agricultural economics as it has developed to date, we can not expect a very direct contribution toward the solution of the problem of readjustments from studies planned and conducted solely with the view of recording and measuring the changes and adjustments that have taken place in an area, or determine studies designed to the extent and rapidity of adjustments that are likely to occur in response to changing prices and costs.

To be really helpful we must take the very positive attitude of endeavoring to determine the changes and readjustments that will be best for the farms in a particular area, and having made these determinations, we must make every effort to acquaint farmers with the results of our findings and assist them in putting the results into practice.

There are several hundred different types of farming areas in the country. You have all seen the maps prepared by Doctor Spillman and Doctor Baker and by some of the State colleges delineating these areas and indicating some of their major characteristics. Some of these areas are large, some are small; parts of two or more States are included in many of them. Each area and region must be studied as a unit without regard to State lines and the systems of farming determined that promise to give the best returns to the farmers of that area. Present and prospective economic conditions and the latest improvements in technique must be considered simultaneously with soil and climatic conditions.

In making these determinations the economists may find it necessary to use the method of experimentation. All over the country farmers are carrying on costly economic experiments, growing crops they have not grown before, buying new machines and testing them, sometimes trying entirely new types of farming. Economic experimentation, while it has not become a common method with the agricultural economists, is not without precedent in the agricultural colleges. The analysis of the situation in an area might indicate that some system of farming or some method of production of a particular crop is better adapted to the conditions of the area than any system or method which has yet been tried by the farmers of the area. This may be true in many areas. In such cases sound research procedure would call for testing the conclusions in an experimental way before recommending them to the farmers of the area.

To be sure such a procedure might seem to many to be too slow and in some quarters it would be considered very expensive, but certainly it would bring results more rapidly and at a much lower cost to society than can be expected from the unplanned and undirected experiments individual farmers are constantly making in their efforts to adjust their operations to changed conditions.

And it certainly would be more scientific to follow such a procedure than to assume, especially in times like the present, that some farmers in every area have already worked out the best systems and practices for the area and that our procedure should be simply to find the "most successful" farmers and recommend that all others follow their lead.

This problem of readjustment calls for a program of research in the economics of agricultural production of a much higher order than has yet been attempted. It calls for cooperation of the economists with engineers, plant and animal breeders, soils technologists, and many others. The results of the studies must be reviewed from time to time to determine if changing economic conditions, improvements in technique, or other factors necessitate revisions.

The research program must be accompanied by a carefully planned and executed extension program designed to acquaint the farmers in every area with the results of the research and to aid individuals in deciding what readjustments to make and how to make them. In my opinion, it is the greatest challenge that has ever come to the agricultural research and extension agencies.

I am sure every member of this association feels as Dean Mumford, of Illinois, did when he said at one of the sessions last year that "in future attempts looking toward agricultural betterment in the United States, the agricultural college and experiment station must play a more important part than they have played during the past 10 or 15 years." I submit that the rate of betterment of the situation will depend primarily upon the rapidity with which sound readjustments in production are made, and that the agricultural colleges, the experiment stations, and the United States Department of Agriculture can, if they will, place them-

selves in position to play a very important part in the movement toward readjustment.

I understand that a plan to augment the extension services by the employment of additional county agents who would devote their entire time to advising with farmers on their economic problems is being discussed by the extension section of this association. Certainly, the research agencies as well as the extension agencies must be strengthened very materially if they are to grapple successfully with the readjustment problem. I trust that the speakers to follow me will outline more definitely and specifically the research needs and point out ways in which the research agencies may be strengthened.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader whether, if we begin on the Private Calendar at 2 o'clock to-morrow, which in all probability we will, and we run on for three hours, he will compel us to hold a night session to-morrow night?

Mr. TILSON. I feel obligated to the House to give an opportunity for at least a three hours' session on the Private Calendar. If we should finish the bill now under consideration by 2 o'clock to-morrow and could then give three hours to the Private Calendar, I should then feel that we might adjourn instead of having a night session; otherwise I feel that I should insist upon an evening session.

Mr. COLLINS. Suppose we should get through with this bill by 3 o'clock.

Mr. TILSON. Then we might run for three hours on the Private Calendar and not adjourn until 6 o'clock. However, I should like to have a three hours' session on the Private Calendar, as I think that is only fair to all.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday of this week District business may be in order instead of Monday of next week. The Navy Department appropriation bill will not be ready for consideration on Saturday, and Monday is District day. My purpose is simply to exchange these two days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday it may be in order to consider District of Columbia business instead of on Monday of next week. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it that the gentleman has no important legislation which he wants to consider at this time rather than District bills?

Mr. TILSON. There are a number of bills which the gentlemen seem to think are important enough to demand early consideration. I had agreed that if able I would give them an opportunity to consider District bills on Monday next. The Navy Department appropriation bill is not ready to go on Saturday, but it will be ready Monday.

Mr. GARNER. I am asking for the gentleman's own interpretation of his request. If I understand, the gentleman is asking to substitute Saturday for Monday. The gentleman could take up, regardless of Monday being District day, or Saturday, any important legislation which he thought ought to have early consideration, but I suppose the gentleman has no such legislation which he wants to take up for early consideration.

Mr. TILSON. We have the Navy Department appropriation bill, which we want to take up the first moment it is ready.

Mr. GARNER. Is that the only important legislation?

Mr. TILSON. No; there is other important legislation, but we want to get the Navy Department appropriation bill out of the way before we take up other important legislation.

Mr. GARNER. I understand the gentleman does; but has the gentleman any other pressing business which the House is supposed to consider at an early date?

Mr. TILSON. No more important than District of Columbia business.

Mr. GARNER. That is what I was trying to get the gentleman to say from the beginning.

Mr. TILSON. It is necessary to keep faith with the District, and I had agreed to give them a day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 5724. An act authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15592. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 6, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, February 6, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 (10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the development of an aircraft combining a heavier-than-air type of airplane with a lighter-than-air craft suitable for transport purposes for the Army Air Corps. (H. R. 14819.)

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS (10.30 a. m.)

To consider bills on reapportionment.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (10 a. m.)

Second deficiency bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

815. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the president of the American War Mothers, transmitting report of the American War Mothers from October 5, 1929, to January 1, 1931, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. J. Res. 404. A joint resolution to change the name of B Street NW., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2492). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16302. A bill to authorize an investigation with respect to the construction of a dam across the Owyhee River within the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, Nev., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4799. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr., and at or near South Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2498). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5114. An act to legalize bridges across the Staunton River at Brookneal, route No. 18, Campbell County, and at Clover, Halifax County, route No. 12, State of Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2499). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5255. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay; without amendment (Rept. No. 2500). Referred to House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5392. An act to legalize a bridge across the Pigeon River at or near Mineral Center, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2501). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5473. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2502). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16154. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2503). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16333. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the cities of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2504). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16334. A bill to extend the times for the commencement and completion of the bridge of the county of Norman and the town and village of Halstad, in said county, in the State of Minnesota, and the county of Traill and the town of Herberg, in said county, in the State of North Dakota, across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2505). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16337. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Black River at or near Pocahontas, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2506). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16246. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2507). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16254. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2508). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16416. A bill authorizing the Dixie Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River and the Licking River at or near the junction of the Ohio and Licking

Rivers to connect Cincinnati, Ohio, with Covington, Ky., and Newport, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2509). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16419. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Madison, Ark., on State Highway No. 70; without amendment (Rept. No. 2510). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16421. A bill authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2511). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16471. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2512). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16655. A bill authorizing Dalles City, a municipal corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2513). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16561. A bill to authorize the Department of Public Works of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River in the towns of Erving and Gill, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2514). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16632. A bill to legalize a quay in Milburn Creek at Baldwin Harbor, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2515). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16696. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to continue the system of pay and allowances, etc., for officers and men on vessels of the Department of Commerce in operation as of July 1, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 16470. A bill to prohibit the use of public funds for the purchase of oleomargarine; with amendment (Rept. No. 2518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 16111. A bill to amend sections 1 and 7 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Regina Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2141. A bill to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Scharbonaugh; with amendment (Rept. No. 2495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12301. A bill for the relief of John S. Dodge; with amendment (Rept. No. 2496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12505. A bill for the relief of Catherine L. Merrill; without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 2497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STALKER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 16691. A bill permitting the laying of a conduit across E and F Streets SW., in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7095) for the relief of Jesse Perry; Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 13601) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ashton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16873) for the relief of Thomas S. Garen; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 16884) to provide for extending during the present emergency the time of payment of loans made by Federal land banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 16885) for the erection of a public building at Louisville, Winston County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 16886) to authorize advances to the reclamation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 16887) to amend section 53, chapter 1, title 31, of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16888) providing for the establishment of the check-dam system to prevent loss from drought, erosion, flood, increase the water supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the erection of a Veterans' Bureau hospital in Vermont; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 16889) granting an increase of pension to Johanna S. W. Micksch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 16890) for the relief of Bradley R. Boughton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16891) granting an increase of pension to Isabella N. Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16892) for the relief of Thomas Newton Miranda; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 16893) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16894) authorizing the enrollment of certain Indians residing in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 16895) granting a pension to Georgia E. Scranton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 16896) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa J. Whitmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16897) granting an increase of pension to Phebe T. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16898) for the relief of Fanny M. Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 16899) renewing and extending Patent No. 1100551 to Filbert L. Gabris and Charles H. Jeffry; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 16900) granting a pension to Lavina E. Starks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16901) for the relief of Charles E. Dagenett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 16902) granting a pension to Julia A. S. Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16903) granting an increase of pension to Laney H. Maples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 16904) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16905) granting a pension to Isaac Bilyeu (Bilyew, Bylew); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16906) granting of pension to Margaret A. Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9108. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of members of Dafter Grange, Dafter, Mich., urging the United States Government to aid in making the water and electric power of the Sault Ste. Marie River available to agriculture at a reasonable rate; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9109. Also, petition of Upper Peninsula Supervisors' Association of Michigan, requesting Michigan Senators and Representatives to use all reasonable efforts to pass an act at the next session of Congress establishing a proper tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9110. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9111. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of citizens of the State of Illinois, urging the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9112. By Mr. CABLE: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Jackson Center, Ohio, requesting immediate legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of World War veterans, to grant service connection for chronic constitutional diseases, and to provide better hospital facilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9113. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Resolution adopted by members of the Harry T. Anderson Post, No. 140, the American Legion, at Grand Meadow, Minn., providing for the immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9114. By Mr. CLAGUE: Resolution of Easton Dairy Co-operative Association, Easton, Minn., urging passage of Brigham bill, H. R. 15934; also resolution of Minnesota Jersey Cattle Club, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue permitting the use of bleached yellow palm oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine without the payment of a tax of 10 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9115. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 461, Round Lake, Minn., urging the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9116. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of Rev. Orval E. Walker and 11 other citizens of Onawa, Monona County, Iowa, in support of the Sparks-Capper amendment to the

Constitution (proposed) to exclude unnaturalized aliens and count only citizens when making the new apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9117. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the citizens of Massachusetts, asking that cash payment be made on the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9118. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain residents of Racine, Wis., urging the immediate payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9119. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of 32 residents of St. Clair and Macomb Counties, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9120. By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of Gold Star Post, No. 78, American Legion, Manchester, Tenn., in favor of payment of adjusted-compensation certificates at face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9121. Also, petition of Gold Star Post, No. 78, American Legion, Manchester, Tenn., in defense of Gen. Smedley D. Butler; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9122. Also, petition of Gold Star Post, No. 78, American Legion, Manchester, Tenn., in favor of declaring November 11 a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9123. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Leo. J. Gionet and 14 additional veterans and citizens of the first congressional district, New Hampshire, favoring the passage of the Patman bonus bill, H. R. 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9124. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of B. C. McGinnis urging a hospital pay for veterans of the World War and help for their families; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9125. By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Dane County (Wis.) Holstein Breeders' Association, asking for increase of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9126. Also, resolution of the Green Grove Farmers' Local Union, of Green Grove, Clark County, Wis., asking for increase of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9127. By Mr. JAMES of Michigan: Petition of Auxiliary of Reino Post, No. 21, American Legion, urging the support of the principle of immediate cash retirement of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9128. By Mr. KEMP: Petition of 227 World War veterans of Hammond, La., favoring immediate cash payment for adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9129. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of Massachusetts, urging passage of House bill 7884, to exempt dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9130. By Mr. McKEOWN: Resolutions passed by the Seminole Protective Association, an organization consisting of over 500 full-blood restricted Seminole Indians, protesting passage of Senate bill 5553; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

9131. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition of 50 citizens of Maine, urging the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9132. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Vivisection Investigation League, and others, of Tenaflly, N. J., urging passage of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9133. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of citizens of Wellsville, N. Y., indorsing the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9134. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by Mrs. H. C. Keiber, president, and Mrs. Louis Blitsch, secretary, of the Waterloo City Council of Parents and Teachers, Waterloo, Iowa, urging the passage of the Grant Hudson motion pic-

ture bill (H. R. 9986); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9135. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Woodston, Kans., favoring the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9136. Also, petition of Young Women's Christian Association, of Bird City, Kans., favoring the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9137. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of registered voters of the first congressional district of Massachusetts, in favor of the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9138. By Mr. SWING: Petition of various citizens of the State of California, urging the enactment of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9139. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of sundry citizens of the fourteenth congressional district of Massachusetts, approving enactment of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal for the calendar days February 2, February 3, February 4, and February 5 may be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13584) to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 3165. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and report upon a claim of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes for fair and just compensation for the remainder of the leased district lands;

H. R. 2335. An act providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list of the Navy; and

H. R. 15592. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do, if I may have the floor when a quorum is secured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that he should state that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] had the floor when the Senate recessed yesterday, and would be entitled to it when the pending appropriation bill is again before the Senate. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Smith
Barkley	Frazier	La Follette	Smoot
Bingham	George	McGill	Steck
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Stelwer
Blaine	Glass	McNary	Swanson
Blease	Glenn	Morrow	Shephens
Borah	Goff	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Gould	Norris	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Trammell
Bulkeley	Harris	Oddie	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Patterson	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Phipps	Wagner
Carey	Hatfield	Pine	Walcott
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hebert	Reed	Waterman
Cutting	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson	Schall	Williamson
Deneen	Jones	Sheppard	
Dill	Kean	Shipstead	
Fess	Kendrick	Shortridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will, if I may have the floor afterwards.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

BUSINESS OF TUESDAY EVENING'S SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if Senators will peep into the Legislative Calendar they will observe about 250 bills awaiting consideration by this body. Two weeks ago I asked and obtained unanimous consent for the consideration at an evening session of unobjected bills on the calendar, at which time in less than three hours the same number of bills were given consideration. I desire particularly that we may give sufficient notice to Members so they can arrange other matters. Therefore I am asking a unanimous-consent agreement for a call of the calendar on Tuesday night next. I submit the proposed agreement, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is proposed by unanimous consent that at not later than 5.30 o'clock p. m., on Tuesday, February 10, 1931, the Senate take a recess until 7.30 o'clock p. m., at which hour it shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar, subject to the limitations of debate provided in Rule VIII, and continue their consideration until the calendar is completed, or until not later than 11 o'clock p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar which has also been given a position upon the so-called steering committee program, the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes. After some consideration and investigation I believe there will not be any protracted debate on the bill. I do not want to interfere with the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Oregon, but I would like to submit a supplemental unanimous-consent proposal to ascertain whether it could be incorporated into his proposed agreement. It would be to the effect that at 7.30 o'clock on next Tuesday night the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1232, the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes, and that on or before 8.30 o'clock p. m. the Senate shall proceed to vote upon all amendments that may be pending and all amendments that may be offered and upon the bill through its various parliamentary stages to